Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-94-011
Tuesday
18 January 1994

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-94-011 *18 January 1994*

CONTENTS

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Russian Border Troops To Guard CIS States' Borders *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Kozyrev on Foreign Policy Issues Regarding CIS, Baltics *[Radio Rossii]* 1
Comments on Military Presence *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
Baltics on Russian Membership in Council of Europe *[BNS]* 2
Oppose Admission *[Vilnius International]* 2
Aide Says Kazakh Battalion To Fulfill Tajikistan Mission *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jan]* 2
Azerbaijan Proposes Immediate Cease-Fire at Tbilisi Talks *[Radio Rossii]* 2
Belarus May Have To Leave CIS if Charter Not Ratified *[INTERFAX]* 3
Schedule of Upcoming CIS Official Activities Reported *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 15 Jan]* 3
ITAR-TASS Reviews Evening News Bulletins 14 Jan 3
Carries Press Review for 15 Jan 4
Carries Press Review for 18 Jan 5

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Yeltsin Gives Statement at News Conference With Clinton *[Russian TV]* 6
Clinton Statement at News Conference *[Russian TV]* 7
Question-Answer Session *[Russian TV]* 8
Clinton on Russia's Role in 'Partnership for Peace' *[ITAR-TASS]* 11
Kozyrev, Christopher Sign Agreement on Radiation Study *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
'Official Dinner' Held for Clinton 14 Jan 12
Clinton Delivers Toast *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
'Text' of Yeltsin's Toast *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
Further on 'Official' Kremlin Dinner *[ITAR-TASS]* 13
Yeltsin Gives Farewell Address to President Clinton *[Moscow TV]* 14
Clinton Accompanied by Chernomyrdin *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Clinton Departs Moscow for Minsk *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
White House Official Sums Up Results of Summit *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Kozyrev Notes 'Absence of a Sensation' *[INTERFAX]* 15
Yeltsin Adviser Hails Success of Summit *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
Outcome of Yeltsin-Clinton Meeting Assessed *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 15 Jan]* 15
'Chief Result' Noted *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
'New Flight Plans' for ICBM's, Russian-U.S. Relations *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jan]* 18
'Mature Strategic Global Partnership' With U.S. *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 15 Jan]* 18
Results of Clinton's Europe Tour Summed Up *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jan]* 19
Paper Cites U.S., UK, French Media on Clinton Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jan]* 20
Clinton Visit Leaves 'Question Mark' Over Reform *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Jan]* 21
TU Leader Satisfied With 14 Jan Talks With Clinton *[INTERFAX]* 21
Rights Campaigners Seek To Tell Clinton of Abuses *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jan]* 21
Kravchuk Holds News Conference in Moscow 14 Jan 22
Denies Compensation Rumor *[Radio Rossii]* 22
Greets Deal as 'Historic' *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
Hails Tripartite Nuclear Arms Agreement *[INTERFAX]* 22
Warns of Danger of Zhirinovskiy *[INTERFAX]* 23
Official Reaction to Tripartite Agreement Noted 23
Kozyrev on Security Guarantees *[INTERFAX]* 23
Kozyrev on Compensation *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Mamedov Says Russia Should Favor Ukraine *[INTERFAX]* 24
Russian, Ukrainian Officials Comment *[Russian TV]* 25
Defense Officials Meet *[INTERFAX]* 26
Political Situation in Kiev Noted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 26
'Secret Diplomacy' Helped *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 27

Weapons-Grade Uranium Contract With United States Viewed *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 15 Jan]* .. 28
Weapons-Grade Plutonium Stored *[Hamburg DIE WOCHE 13 Jan]* 29
Trade Minister Says U.S. Still Discriminates Against Russia *[Moscow International]* 30
Praise for Ambassador Pickering's Performance *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 30
Pickering Reiterates U.S. Support *[INTERFAX]* 31
Space Shuttle Launch With Cosmonaut Postponed *[ITAR-TASS]* 31
Kozyrev Comments on 'Partnership for Peace' *[ITAR-TASS]* 31
Grachev Assesses Relations With NATO *[Radio Rossii]* 32
Bank's Solovov on Inter-Bank Agreement With Belarus *[INTERFAX]* 32
Shokhin on Merging Monetary Systems With Belarus *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
Kozyrev on Talks With Acting Moldovan Foreign Minister *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
Talks With Estonia Postponed; Delegation Head Ill *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
Latvia Opens Consulate in Pskov Oblast *[Russian TV]* 34
Churkin Stresses Importance of Geneva Talks on Bosnia *[INTERFAX]* 34
Army Paper Cites UK 'Caution' on Bosnia Air Strikes *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jan]* 34
Submarines Being Sold to DPRK for Scrap Metal *[Vladivostok Radio]* 34
To Be Disassembled in Japan *[Moscow International]* 34
'Specialists' on Reusing Submarines *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 35
Navy Denies Sale *[Radio Rossii]* 35
ROK, Japan Consider Repatriation of Sakhalin Citizens *[INTERFAX]* 35
Talks With Japan Suspended 'Indefinitely' *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 15 Jan]* 36
Japanese 'At a Loss' *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 36
Moscow Radio Commentary on Iran's Nuclear Programs *[Moscow International]* 37
Zhirinovskiy Views 'German Interests' *[Munich DEUTSCHE NATIONAL-ZEITUNG 14 Jan]* 37

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political Issues

Government Meeting Postponed Due To Ongoing Reshuffle *[ITAR-TASS]* 40
Yeltsin, Chernomyrdin Discuss Composition of Government *[ITAR-TASS]* 40
Soskovets To Participate in Talks *[INTERFAX]* 40
Talks Continue *[ITAR-TASS]* 40
Yushenkov Says Fedorov Will Resign, Chubays Will Stay *[INTERFAX]* 40
More on Chubays as Vice Premier *[SEGODNYA 14 Jan]* 40
Premier's Cabinet Concept Seen Diverging From Yeltsin's *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 15 Jan]* . 41
Fedorov Announces Conditions for Remaining in Government *[INTERFAX]* 41
Cancels Planned News Conference *[ITAR-TASS]* 41
To Leave Government *[Radio Rossii]* 42
Reportedly Undecided *[Russian TV]* 42
Does Not Rule Out Resignation *[INTERFAX]* 42
Offered Finance Minister Role *[INTERFAX]* 42
Fedorov's Future Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 42
Social Protection Minister Submits Resignation *[Russian TV]* 43
Gaydar Rejects Position of First Deputy Premier *[Radio Rossii]* 43
Gives Reason for Rejecting Post *[ITAR-TASS]* 43
Aims to Work With Government *[ITAR-TASS]* 44
Explains Decisions *[Radio Rossii]* 44
Sends Letter to Yeltsin *[INTERFAX]* 44
Announces Resignation to Journalists *[Moscow TV]* 45
Comments on Lack of Influence *[ITAR-TASS]* 45
Further Gaydar Comments *[ITAR-TASS]* 46
Grants Interview *[Russian TV]* 46
Comments on Parliamentary Role *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Jan]* 48
Kostikov Hopes Resignation Will Be Refused *[INTERFAX]* 49
Yeltsin Accepts Gaydar's Resignation *[ITAR-TASS]* 49
Yeltsin, Chernomyrdin 'Sympathetic' *[INTERFAX]* 49
Chernomyrdin Not Surprised *[ITAR-TASS]* 50
Fedorov Understands Gaydar's Decision *[Moscow Radio]* 50
'Complete Surprise' to Fedorov *[INTERFAX]* 50
Fedorov on 'Beginning of Changes' *[ITAR-TASS]* 50

Other Officials View Resignation of Gaydar 50
Shokhin Comments *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Shakhray Views Resignation *[INTERFAX]* 51
Government Officials React *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Ambartsumov on Resignation *[INTERFAX]* 52
Sergeyev Comments *[INTERFAX]* 52
Poltoranin Assesses Resignations *[INTERFAX]* 52
Baburin Comments *[INTERFAX]* 52
Leading Politicians, Officials Comment *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 18 Jan]* 53
Kuzbass Governor Comments *[ITAR-TASS]* 54
Yavlinskiy Unaware of Being Possible Gaydar Replacement *[INTERFAX]* 54
Does Not Expect Government Post *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Says Gaydar 'Incompetent' *[Tehran IRNA]* 54
Russia's Choice Officials React to Gaydar Resignation 55
Secretary Yushenkov Comments *[Russian TV]* 55
Faction Coordinator Responds *[Radio Rossii]* 55
Group Adopts Statement *[ITAR-TASS]* 55
Member Pochinok Reacts *[INTERFAX]* 55
More Russia's Choice Comment *[INTERFAX]* 56
Liberal Democratic Party Welcomes Resignation *[INTERFAX]* 56
Zhirinovskiy Response Noted *[INTERFAX]* 56
Business Circles Concerned Over Resignation *[ITAR-TASS]* 56
Further Businessmen Comment *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 57
Bankers View Resignation *[INTERFAX]* 57
Commentary Views Gaydar Departure *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 58
Scenarios Considered *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 59
Reasons for Resignation Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 59
Resignation Seen as Logical *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 Jan]* 60
Shokhin Insists on Remaining Deputy Prime Minister *[ITAR-TASS]* 61
Sergey Aleksashenko Appointed Commission Head *[ITAR-TASS]* 61
Chernomyrdin's True Role, Intentions Analyzed *[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS 15 Jan]* 61
Number of Vice Premiers May Increase *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 14 Jan]* 62
'Sources' View New Government Posts, Structure *[INTERFAX]* 62
Agrarian Party Leader Views Political Situation *[Brussels LE SOIR 14 Jan]* 63
Constitutional Court Reinstates Justice *[INTERFAX]* 64
Government Decree Averting Press Strike Assessed *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 14 Jan]* 64

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kravchuk Holds News Conference on Return From Moscow *[Kiev International]* 66
Zlenko: Accord 'Not Subject' to Ratification *[INTERFAX]* 69
On Moscow's Refusal To Wipe Out Debt *[INTERFAX]* 70
Urges EEC To Evaluate Nonnuclear Goal *[Kiev Radio]* 70
Zlenko, Shmarov, Radetskyy View Nuclear Accord *[Kiev International]* 70
Shmarov: Pact Will End 'Isolation' *[Kiev Radio]* 76
Other Officials View Issues *[Kiev Radio]* 76
Parliament To Discuss Accord 'Next Week' *[ITAR-TASS]* 76
Plyushch Refrains From Comment *[UNIAR]* 77
Deputy Sets Conditions for Ratification *[INTERFAX]* 77
Deputies Oppose Nuclear Weapons Agreement *[Kiev International]* 77
Accord Attempt To 'Deceive' *[UNIAN]* 78
Deal 'Not Likely' To Be Implemented *[INTERFAX]* 78
Rukh Assesses Kravchuk Actions as 'Treachery' *[ITAR-TASS]* 78
Ukrainian Nationalists Reject Nuclear Agreement *[UNIAR]* 79
Lvov Council Head Airs Doubts on Nuclear Accord *[UNIAN]* 79

National Affairs

Results, Reaction to Crimean Elections Reported 79

Bahrov, Meshkov To Face Runoff *[Kiev Radio]* 79
Breakdown of Preliminary Results *[UNIAR]* 79
Further on Results *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 80
Bahrov Comments on Lead in Poll *[UNIAN]* 80
RPK Deputy Allays Fears *[UNIAR]* 81
Kravchuk Fires Yermakov *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Returns Being Examined *[INTERFAX]* 81
Deputy: Elections Unconstitutional *[Kiev International]* 82
Crimean Parties Form Bloc Against Governing Party *[UNIAN]* 82
Shots Fired at Communist Party Headquarters *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jan]* 82
Communist Party Statement *[INTERFAX]* 83

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

U.S.-Belarusian Documents Signed Before Clinton Visit *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Clinton Discusses Cooperation With Officials *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Cooperation Documents Signed *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Joint Statement Signed *[ITAR-TASS]* 85
Meets Opposition Leaders *[ITAR-TASS]* 85
Visits Kuropaty, Leaves for Airport *[ITAR-TASS]* 85
Completes Official Visit *[ITAR-TASS]* 85
Kravchenko on Hopes for Uranium Compensation *[INTERFAX]* 86
Shushkevich, Kebich Discuss Clinton Visit *[Minsk Radio]* 86
U.S. Allots $100 Million for Disarmament *[Minsk Radio]* 87
Shushkevich on Gaydar Remarks on Monetary Union *[Moscow TV]* 87
Kebich Views Monetary Union *[ITAR-TASS]* 87
Myasnikovich on Monetary Merger *[ITAR-TASS]* 88

Moldova

Commander Denies 14th Army on Alert in Dniester *[ITAR-TASS]* 88
Russian Army Commander Denies Plotting Coup *[INTERFAX]* 88
Former Minister Discusses Russian Army Presence *[BASAPRESS]* 88

CENTRAL ASIA

Tajikistan

Deputy Defense Minister Wounded, Driver Killed *[Dushanbe Radio]* 90
'Intensive' Mortar Attack on Afghan Border Post *[ITAR-TASS]* 90
At Least 10 Killed *[ITAR-TASS]* 90

Turkmenistan

Niyazov Wins Further Term After Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 90
Receives Over 99 Percent *[Moscow Radio]* 90
Elected National Council Chairman *[ITAR-TASS]* 90
Niyazov Reassures Russian-Speaking Population *[ITAR-TASS]* 91

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Decree Orders Reshuffle of Security Agencies *[ITAR-TASS]* 92
Security Services Dissolved *[ARMENPRES]* 92
Spokesman on Karabakh, Security Changes *[Yerevan Radio]* 92
Azerbaijan Offensive Said Repulsed *[Yerevan Radio]* 93
Iranian Official on Joint Initiative on Karabakh *[Yerevan International]* 93
Iran's Director for CIS Affairs Arrives for Visit 94

President Favors Expansion of Ties *[Tehran IRNA]* 94
Foreign Minister Receives Official *[ARMENPRES]* 94
Premier Receives Iranian Charge d'Affaires *[Yerevan Radio]* 94
Spokesman Positive Over Russia's Karabakh Role *[ITAR-TASS]* 94
Comments on Political Settlement *[INTERFAX]* 95
'Split' Over Karabakh Recognition Noted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 95
Intellectuals Invite Zhirinovskiy for Jan Visit *[KURANTY 14 Jan]* 96

Georgia

Shevardnadze on Summit, Geneva Abkhazia Talks *[ITAR-TASS]* 96
Wants UN Peacekeepers Sent Soon *[INTERFAX]* 96
Shevardnadze Satisfied With Visit to Turkey *[INTERFAX]* 96
Shevardnadze Grants 'Weekly' Interview 17 Jan *[Tbilisi Radio]* 97
Comments on Social Situation *[Tbilisi Radio]* 101
'Mkhedrioni' Paramilitary Group Disarms *[INTERFAX]* 102
Interior Ministry Sends APCs to Downtown Tbilisi *[ITAR-TASS]* 102
Gamsakhurdia Widow Accuses Ministry of 'Misinformation' *[INTERFAX]* 102
Appeals for Burial Help *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Issues Burial 'Conditions' *[Tbilisi Radio]* 102

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Minister Luik on Clinton-Yeltsin Meeting *[Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Release]* 104
Comments on New Appointments *[ETA NEWS BULLETIN]* 104
Leaders Request To Join 'Partnership for Peace' *[BNS]* 104
Negotiator to Talks With Russia Views Delay *[BNS]* 104
President, Premier Disagree on Russian Money *[SEGODNYA 14 Jan]* 105

Latvia

Troops To Fire To Protect 'Military Objects' *[ITAR-TASS]* 105
Ulmanis Views Order as 'Provocative' *[Riga Radio]* 106
Russia Said Ready To 'Again Annex Baltics' *[BNS]* 106
Skrunda Radar Station To Be Military Base *[Moscow Radio]* 106
'Definite Compromise' Reached *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jan]* 107
Ulmanis' 'Bewilderment' Over Clinton Remarks *[INTERFAX]* 107

Russian Border Troops To Guard CIS States' Borders

LD1701224494 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1930 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Regarding the federal border guard service at the Russian border troops main command. This structure was set up very recently in accordance with the Russian president's decree of 30 December 1993. It is headed by Colonel General Andrey Nikolayev, commander of the border troops. At a recent briefing he summed up the results of the work of the border troops in 1993, and also defined future tasks. In particular, it was stressed that the Russian border troops will continue to defend the external borders of a number of CIS states. This is what Colonel General Andrey Nikolayev said on this subject:

[Begin Nikolayev recording] In 1994 the units and subunits of the border troops will continue to defend—on a contractual basis, worked out on an intergovernmental and interstate level—the state borders in Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, and to participate in the defense of state borders in Turkmenia. The documents on the joint defense of the borders have been signed, and now they must be put into practice.

In this connection it is important to stress that, first, the defense of the external borders of the commonwealth states is being carried out, first and foremost, for us Russians, in the interest of Russia itself. Second, this involves the guarantee of its national interests in the most important geo-political regions, where Russia's strategic interests exist, existed, and, hopefully, will continue to exist.

I agree that cooperation in defending the border, when sovereign independent states cooperate in defending the border, is a completely new thing. There is no such precedent in history. But history also has seen no such thing as a state breaking up into 15 states in the twinkling of an eye. You understand, two years have gone by, and we finally realized that it is very important to have not only rights in the CIS, but probably obligations as well. [end recording]

Kozyrev on Foreign Policy Issues Regarding CIS, Baltics

LD1801095494 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0900 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] Defending the rights and interests of Russian Federation citizens in the near abroad is one of Russia's main foreign policy tasks, Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev declared today at a conference on issues of foreign policy regarding the CIS and Baltic countries. Andrey Kozyrev singled out a number of foreign policy trends in this region: strengthening economic positions, enhancing the effectiveness of actions taken, and creating new mechanisms for cooperation.

Speaking about problems relating to how the CIS economic union functions, the foreign ministry head commented that Russia should try to avoid hasty decisions, in particular where creating single currencies is concerned. At the same time, he gave a positive evaluation of the recent agreement between Russian and Belarus on the forthcoming unification of currency systems, describing this as a good example of a well-considered agreement, INTERFAX reports.

Comments on Military Presence

LD1801102594 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1006 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Aleksandr Krylovich and Georgy Shmelyov]

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev said on Tuesday [18 January] that it is necessary for Russia to keep its "military presence" in former Soviet republics in order to prevent forces hostile to Russia from filling in the "security vacuum".

The minister told a meeting of Russian ambassadors in the CIS and the Baltics that raising the issue of a complete end to Russian military presence is an "extreme approach".

According to Kozyrev, the solution lies in the middle between a complete withdrawal and full military presence. "We should not withdraw from those regions which have been the sphere of Russian interests for centuries and we should not fear these words about the military presence", the minister said.

A "security vacuum" will emerge as soon as the Russian troops leave the region which will be "inevitable filled in by forces which are often not friendly, and in many cases even directly hostile to Russian interests", Kozyrev said, adding that the CIS and the Baltics comprise a region of "priority vital interests for Russia which also poses the major threats to the interests".

The conflicts and problems in the former USSR directly affect Russian internal developments and everyday life, according to the minister who added that at the same time the region opens vast possibilities for better relations and friendly contacts, as well as for enhanced Russian influence.

Kozyrev listed the protection of the rights of Russians in the former Soviet republics as a major strategic foreign policy task and added that the issue of dual citizenship is the key one in the policy. "A better mutual understanding has been reached in this aspect of late", he said.

Other priority tasks include the creation and improvement of cooperation mechanisms, the drafting of a short-, medium- and long- term strategy of creating an economic union, according to Kozyrev.

He said an "individual approach" is necessary in this aspect, especially in monetary unification. "An all-round

assessment of the issues is necessary and such mechanisms should be created which would allow Russia to avoid unjustified expenses while the republics would not feel themselves pushed aside and would not look for new partners", the minister said.

The CIS has already reached such a degree of maturity when it feels it desirable to "become a member of world processes". "It is developing from a regional into a global factor", Kozyrev said.

Baltics on Russian Membership in Council of Europe

WS1401204594 Tallinn BNS in English 1603 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Vilnius, Jan 14, BNS—Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian delegations to the Council of Europe [CE] decided in Vilnius Friday [14 January] that Russia must not be admitted to the organization until its troops are withdrawn from the territory of Latvia and Estonia.

The three delegations also discussed other conditions of Russia's membership in the CE, the head of the Lithuanian delegation, Algirdas Gricius, said at a press conference Friday. Russia has already fulfilled part of the demands—it has a new Constitution and a new parliament, he said.

But, Lithuania and Estonia, as members of the council, and Latvia, which enjoys special guest membership, will insist that Russia solve national and ethnic problems on its territory. The Baltics also want Russia to assess the Soviet aggression upon the three states in 1940. Russia must also promise not to interfere with the internal affairs of other countries and "must become a normal state," said Tunne Kelam, member of the Estonian delegation.

In Vilnius, the three delegations coordinated their positions for the upcoming session of the CE General Assembly. The session will start in Strasbourg Jan. 24 and will reportedly focus on possibilities of expanding Europe politically. The three Baltic states agreed to support the idea of including the Caucasian region in the political map of Europe.

Lithuanians and Estonians decided to circulate a joint statement on the recent NATO summit in Brussels and a joint resolution of the Baltic Assembly on Russian army presence in Estonia and Latvia.

Roland Blezurs, secretary of the Latvian delegation, said this week's incident with the Russian military in his country revealed the kind of pressure that may be caused by the presence of foreign troops.

The three delegations also discussed the economic and political situation in the Baltic states.

Oppose Admission

LD1501090894 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] The Lithuanian and Estonian delegations at the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe will object to Russia's admission to that organization. That position was stated at a news conference on Friday by the heads of the delegations, Algis Gricius, the Lithuanian parliamentary foreign affairs committee's deputy chairman, and Tunne Kelam, deputy chairman of the Estonian state assembly.

The stand on the issue was coordinated in Vilnius at a meeting of the Baltic delegations to the Council of Europe. The Lithuanian and Estonian position was supported by Latvia, which so far has guest status at the Council of Europe.

The Baltic states' key argument against Russia's admission to the Council of Europe is the presence of its troops on Latvian and Estonian territories. Besides, the heads of the Lithuanian and Estonian delegations said Russia must first solve its own problems and stop interfering in the internal affairs of other states. We are waiting for Russia, as the successor to the rights of the Soviet Union, to make an official statement on the 1940 occupation of the Baltic states, Algis Gricius said.

The parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe is due to open in Strasbourg on 24 January.

Aide Says Kazakh Battalion To Fulfill Tajikistan Mission

PM1401133594 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 1

[Anatoliy Ladin report under "Yesterday" rubric: "Kazakhstan Will Fulfill Its Peacemaking Mission to the End"]

[Text] As Tulegen Zhukeyev, state counselor of the Republic of Kazakhstan, told journalists, the Kazakh battalion presently stationed in Khorog, the administrative center of the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast, which is working with Russian border guards to protect the Tajik-Afghan border, will not be withdrawn from the Repulbic of Tajikistan.

All that is happening is that servicemen whose contracts have expired are being replaced. Zhukeyev stressed that Kazakhstan is consistently fulfilling all the documents signed by it regarding participation in the peacemaking mission in Tajikistan.

Azerbaijan Proposes Immediate Cease-Fire at Tbilisi Talks

LD1601214194 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2100 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] During the meeting in Tbilisi between Mamedov and Sarkisyan, the ministers of defense of Azerbaijan

and Armenia, the Azerbaijani side proposed an immediate cease-fire right along the Armenian-Azerbaijani frontline and the opening of a political dialogue by both sides including at presidential level. Interfax reported that the Armenian side was not prepared to take these decisions. The sides agreed to continue consultations between the heads of military departments.

Belarus May Have To Leave CIS if Charter Not Ratified

LD1401204794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1702 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Unless Belarus' parliament ratifies the CIS Charter before January 23, the republic will be automatically removed from the composition of the Commonwealth, CIS Executive Secretary Ivan Korotchenya declared in his interview with Interfax.

He recalled one thesis from the CIS Charter confirmed by heads of states January 22, 1993 in Minsk. The document stipulates that "those sponsor states which adopt commitments according to the present Charter within a year after its adoption by the Council of Heads of States are member-states of the Commonwealth." At the same time Korotchenya stressed that "the Charter is brought into force for all sponsor-states, from the moment they hand over instruments of ratification for storage or for sponsor-states which will hand over their instruments of ratification in a year following adoption of this Charter."

According to Korotchenya, as of today only six states have ratified the CIS Charter, namely Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. Korotchenya said that they expected ratification from Azerbaijan and Georgia in the near future. Russia, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan have already forwarded their instruments of ratification to Belarus' governmental archives, to the country-depository of the CIS.

At the Ashgabat summit leaders of the Commonwealth countries have prolonged the term of ratification of the CIS Charter for Moldova for three months more, said Korotchenya.

The session of the Belarussian parliament is to resume its work in Minsk on January 18. Korotchenya, a people's deputy of this representative body, believes that the issue on ratification of the Commonwealth Charter "must be considered without any delay during the first day of the session's work."

Schedule of Upcoming CIS Official Activities Reported

MK1501132094 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 3

[Unattributed untitled report under the "NEGA Reports" rubric]

[Text] The council of the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly is to resume work shortly. A session of the working group to elaborate a model civil code of the Commonwealth of Independent States will be held in the latter part of January in St. Petersburg. Also at the end of January, there will be a roundtable in St. Petersburg of the Interparliamentary Assembly for problems of development of the CIS with the participation of representatives of government bodies on interstate cooperation. Planned for early in February is a seminar on constitutional reforms in the Commonwealth countries.

The press service has also indicated that a more important start-of-the-year event will be held in February—a session of the council of the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly, invited for which will be all the speakers of parliaments of CIS member countries. It will elect a new chairman of the council of the Interparliamentary CIS Assembly because the powers of the previous chairman—Russian Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov—terminated at the end of last October. Andrey Mazhorov, head of the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly press service, stated that the new head of the Russian Federation Federal Assembly will hardly seek this office. If the council's chairman should be elected in accordance with the positions the CIS countries occupy if ranked in Russian alphabetical order (as is accepted in some organizational structures of the Commonwealth), this seat could first be contested by Azerbaijan Parliament Speaker Rasul Guliyev. A CIS Interparliamentary Assembly chairman's term of office is one year.

The heads of parliament will also approve during the meeting a plan for 1994, and the rules of procedure and the agenda of the next plenary session of the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly council.

ITAR-TASS Reviews Evening News Bulletins 14 Jan

LD1401221294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2151 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—Evening TV news focused today on the Russian-U.S. summit underway in Moscow.

According to the Novosti First Channel news program, Friday was the most saturated day of the Moscow visit of U.S. President Bill Clinton.

The final round of negotiations confirmed the two countries are working for partnership, said Novosti. A proof to it is the Moscow declaration and other documents signed here today.

In the opinion of the Russian TV Vesti news program, the tripartite agreement on elimination of nuclear arms stationed in Ukraine signed today by the Russian, U.S. and Ukrainian presidents is "historic". The document confirms non-nuclear status of Ukraine.

Novosti offered a report from the Spaso-Perovskiy Hospital visited by wife of the Russian President Naina and

wife of the U.S. President Hillary. "Charity and sympathy are genuinely female feelings and it is good wives of the two presidents personify them," said the TV program.

Evening TV news also focused on work of the Russian parliament. Vesti reported in detail voting on candidates for deputies of the Federation Council speaker.

Federation Council members are "very independent, they will not blindly follow instructions of the president or the government head," Chairman of the Chuvash Council of Ministers Valeryan Viktorov told Novosti. Viktorov was elected today a deputy of the Federation Council speaker. He expressed the assurance Federation Council Speaker Vladimir Shumeyko "will not involve in unnecessary confrontation between the president and the government".

"This can mean the beginning of the rouble exchange rate stabilization at a new level," said Vesti commenting on today's tenders at the Moscow Interbank Currency Exchange when the exchange rate of DM [German mark] lowered by eight points. The dollar exchange rate remains the same. The cable stated preservation of a high demand for hard currency.

Carries Press Review for 15 Jan

LD1501075594 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0608 GMT 15 Jan 94

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA on the Russian-U.S. summit:

"The latest summit has not introduced anything particularly new to the two countries' relationships. Expressions of Bill Clinton's support for Boris Yeltsin and his policy of economic reforms have been coming from across the ocean ever since Yeltsin himself broached the subject of reform.

"At the final press conference the two presidents did not say anything sensational similar to that which had been agreed upon in Vancouver or the Tokyo G-7 summit.

"In reference to Russian-U.S. relations, the Moscow summit can be referred to as a working, scheduled, and routine one rather than historic. Were it not for the Ukrainian nuclear weapons issue and the Friday signing of the Russo-Ukrainian-American agreement to eliminate them, one could not have derived from Clinton's visit to Moscow what is usually expected from a meeting between the presidents of great powers".

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA on the live broadcast of Bill Clinton's remarks from the studio of the Ostanikino television centre:

"The Americans did not miss the opportunity to show their president in what he is at his best: producing impression on the audience and winning it over. Who knows what moved Russian citizens more—the political results of Bill Clinton's visit or his sociability and openness (at the needed moment) before ordinary people".

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on U.S. President's first European tour:

"The first European tour along the Brussels-Prague-Kiev-Moscow-Minsk-Geneva route was apparently conceived, firstly, with a view to giving a boost to the international prestige of the U.S. President and, secondly, once again showing support for Boris Yeltsin, the support which the Russian president is permanently in need of".

ROSSIISKAYA GAZETA carries an article by Igor Vlasov, a section head at the committee to the president of the Russian Federation on convention-related problems of chemical and biological weapons.

"All stocks of chemical weapons of Russia are now stored in special arsenals of the Russian Defence Ministry—seven chemical 'thorns' in the body of Russia.... The aggregate amount of chemical weapons is 40,000 tonnes.... The process of eliminating the weapons, provided the Paris convention is ratified, is expected to be started in 1997".

IZVESTIA on Moscow diplomatic circles' irritation with Azerbaijani president's actions:

"In Moscow diplomatic circles, there is felt a certain irritation with the actions of Azerbaijani President Gaydar Aliyev. In words he favours a political solution to the conflict (in Nagorno-Karabakh—note by ITAR-TASS) while in actual fact he is not in a hurry to discontinue the use of force.

"This is possibly accounted for by the fact that the 'war party' in Aliyev's entourage is much more influential than the advocates of power politics among the associates of Armenian leader Ter- Petrosyan. One gathers the impression that the internal political positions of former Politburo member Aliyev are hardly better than those of his unlucky predecessor Elchibey".

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (Red Star) carries an interview with police Colonel-General Mikhail Yegorov, Russia's first deputy minister of the interior and chief of the main department for combatting organised crime.

"As of the end of 1992, 2,800,000 crimes were committed as against 1,200,000 in 1987, that is, the number of crimes grew by almost 150 per cent, that of grave crimes by 160 per cent and murders—by 150 per cent. Last year we manage to break the dynamics of crime growth from 26 per cent (1992) to 1.4 per cent in 1993. The grave crime rate decreased from 31.2 to 23.6 per cent respectively," Yegorov told the newspaper.

TRUD on the discovery of Americium-241 near Chernobyl. The newspaper maintains that Americium-241, a radioactive element which is utterly hazardous to human

health, has been found in the area of the chernobyl nuclear power station. The element's "semi-decay period is approximately 430 years. It is extremely toxic and brings about strong mutations in living organisms".

Another element ostensibly discovered in the area—Americium- 242 (which disintegrates into beta particles) has a period of existence of almost 16 hours. "But the element has an extremely small critical mass—i.e., it is capable of exploding even in minute quantities. The 'sarcophagus' which protects the world from the damaged reactor (of the Chernobyl nuclear power station—note by ITAR-TASS) now possibly cracks and literally bursts at the seams precisely due to the microexplosions of Americium which accumulates in the sarcophagus walls".

VECHERNY PETERBURG reports that the city police headquarters' emergency rescue service has summed up the results of the past year. There were 29,336 fires last year, 5,815 more than in the previous year, with 350 people dying in the fires or being mortally poisoned with carbon monoxide. There were 12 children among the victims of the fires. The aggregate damage inflicted by the fires amounted to more than 138 million roubles.

Carries Press Review for 18 Jan

LD1801062994 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0621 GMT 19 Jan 94

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 18 (TASS)—Yegor Gaydar's statement about his resignation from the post of the first vice-premier of the Russian Government is the leading topic in today's Moscow-based press.

ROSSIISKIYE VESTI carries pronouncements by prominent state and public figures under the front-page banner headline: "A Cabinet Reorganisation All of a Sudden Resulted in a Sunday Governemtnt Crisis".

The newspaper runs the text of Gaydar's letter to President Boris Yeltsin. In the letter, gaydar expressed regret over the fact that decisions, in the preparation of which he did not participate and which he categorically objected to, used to be adopted increasingly often recently.

IZVESTIYA:

Gaydar's resignation was unexpected but not more than an earthquake in a quake-prone area. One can take various views of the policy suggested by Gaydar two years ago, but "the liberalisation of prices..., privatisation—all are directed associated with Gaydar and his team, just as, incidentally, the decline in the living standards of a large proportion of people, shut-downs of factories and other hard problems connected with attempts to cure the chronic totalitarianism by means of a shock therapy".

TRUD queries whether the resignation of the first vice-premier signifies a cardinal change in the reform policy, pointing out that "if a future government will lack Gaydar, Fedorov, Chubays and Pamfilova (the latter three are ministers in charge of finance, privatisation, and social protection of the population), the world community would view that as a sign that radical reforms in Russia are done away with."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) on First Vice-Premier Yegor Gaydar's resignation:

Noting that Gaydar's example is being followed by other members of the Russian Governemnt, the newspaper points out that this happens at a noteworthy moment—elections to the Federal Assembly (parliamcnt) were held recently and parliamentary and political blocs have undergone a considerable regrouping. Next crucial moment in the life of Russia will be not so distant presidential elections.

"Since representatives of the blocs hurried to distance themselves from the present government, it is quite logical to suppose that this is more advantageous that sharing responsibility with it".

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA on the same subject:

The newspaper believes that Gaydar's resignation "cannot change in any way the nature of an economic policy of the Viktor Chernomyrdin government, because the governemnt had no policy to this effect even after Gaydar's comeback".

"The point is that reforms-related theorising receded into the background six months ago with regard to the cabinet's trouble- shooting activities".

PRAVDA strongly criticises the shock therapy policy, at the rise of which Gaydar stood.

"Is it not his policy of slashing credits to industrial enterprises that leads to their shut-down everywhere and a steep increase in unemployment? Was it not he who wanted a common rouble zone within the CIS when the International Monetary Fund wanted it? Why then does he lament this?"

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, touching upon the work of the State Duma, points out in particular:

"Fully confirmed has been the forecast that not a single side in the duma would have a solid edge while political clashes would get exacerbated and become even keener than was the case in the Supreme Soviet".

TRUD carries an interview with President Nikolay Fyodorov of Chuvashia. "I am convinced that Chuvashia can develop and really prosper only as part of Russia", he said.

Yeltsin Gives Statement at News Conference With Clinton

LD1401105894 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0840 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Statement by President Boris Yeltsin at news conference in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, I shall come to the main point right away. U.S. President Clinton's first visit to Russia has been very fruitful. It could not have been otherwise: we know one another too well, there was too much that had to be done, and our peoples too were expecting much of us. This visit is based upon the realities of today, and at the same time looks to the future. Regarding the difficult past, the U.S. President and I closed that book very firmly back in Vancouver.

The work in Moscow proceeded at a tense pace and purposefully. Specific accords and agreements have been reached which are important both for Russia and for the United States—and for the whole world. The negotiations took place at a crucial time for our country. The old habits and stereotypes are crumbling, and an active search for something new is under way both in our country and in the United States.

We could be said to be in the throes of a common Russo-American revolution. The citizens of the Russian Federation approved a new constitution at free and democratic elections, and for the first time elected their own parliament without duress. I do not agree with those who think that our first attempt was a flop. If one looks deeper than the individual names and popularist slogans, then all in all, the people have opted for a better life, for legality, and for predictability.

This is a lesson which we all still have to learn from in order to prevent mistakes being repeated. I confirmed quite definitely to the U.S. President that our course is aimed at the development and deepening of the reforms and with stepping up social orientation. I am sure that the country will gain more stability and a sound social peace. Bill Clinton has expressed a subtle understanding of the peculiarities of our situation. You see, the Americans have experienced and are experiencing quite a lot, too. We can count on complete support for the reforms being carried out by the Russian president, the Government, and the reformers in the new parliament.

I have talked about both the problems in our economy, about the positive changes in it, and about the elements of stabilization. I stressed that at the present time it is not humanitarian aid that we need but full-blooded cooperation, taking into account the transitional nature of the young market economy of Russia.

Specifically I find that, together with the Tokyo package and with Clinton's package in Vancouver, that the most tangible support for Russia would be for the American market to open up to our exports, be it raw materials or machines.

I am very content that today an agreement on uranium has at last been signed after two years of talks.

Cold War restriction must be removed altogether, restrictions like the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Artificial barriers imposed under the pretext that Russia is dumping should be removed, and let's just say that the case with our uranium is more likely just fear of competition from more advanced technology and cheaper material.

Bill Clinton has done much since Vancouver. He has kept his word as regards dismantling the economic obstructions of the Cold War. Discriminatory restrictions have been removed from U.S. internal legislation, or most of them. About 5,000 types of Russian goods are no longer subject to increased taxes. The U.S. President has done much to introduce Russia into international financial and economic organizations. I do not think it will be long before the G-7 becomes the G-8.

Russo-American relations have finally moved into the phase of mature, strategic, global partnership in all spheres during these talks. The partnership has opened the way to general understanding, both of the new prospects ahead and of the new problems. We are both convinced that the modern world should be democratic, open, and integrated.

Regarding equality, mutual benefit, and accounting for each others' interests, there is no need to talk about this anymore, it goes without saying. This principle vector of our partnership is set out in the Moscow declaration which we have signed. It reflects and reinforces the historical improvement in Russian-American relations in Eurasia and the world as a whole.

Our mutual activities aimed at strengthening strategic stability and security are taking on new substance. Thanks to them, in the last few months alone the world and our countries have avoided many traps and errors. There is also an evident positive result—the strengthening of cooperation in the sphere of security and disarmament, peacekeeping, cooperation, and economic openness.

The ground-breaking step which has finally been taken in Moscow is a denouement in documents leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons in Ukraine. I consider the document which was signed today by the three presidents to be historical. Everyone wins from this, first and foremost the Ukrainian people themselves. The agreements reached at our trilateral summit meeting save resources, get rid of disagreement, and give a good example to other countries. They are reinforced by the Russian-American statement on strengthening all regimes for the non-proliferation of weaponry of mass destruction. And the durability of non-proliferation is at present, as is well known, being seriously tested.

The U.S. President brought us right up to date on the Partnership for Peace concept adopted in Brussels. The

idea is seemingly from NATO, but it contains a primordial element of Russian-U.S. joint creative work. This concept is an important step in the creation of a security system from Vancouver to Vladivostok, which rules out the formation of new divisive lines or zones of unequal security.

We see in this idea one of the options for building a new Europe—one of them, but not the only one, of course. We shall put specific content into this channel of cooperation, including in the military sphere. And in doing so we shall not, of course, forget the other collective security structures in Europe, above all the well-tried institutions of the United Nations and CSCE.

I briefed the President in detail about the integrationary processes that have got under way on the territory of the former Soviet Union, and in particular about the latest summit meetings within the context of the CIS. There need be no fear of any neo-imperialist lust here—Russia's only interest is in stability. It is undertaking honest mediatory efforts to extinguish the hotbeds of conflicts on the perimeters of its new borders. We are ready to cooperate widely and even to coordinate our actions here with the United Nations, the CSCE, and with the entire international community. Unfortunately, the international community itself has not as yet shown a great deal of enthusiasm. There has been a wary reaction to our specific proposals, whether in Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabakh, or in Tajikistan.

I think that the United States and ourselves will now have a greater understanding on this very important question.

I firmly raised the question of human rights violations among national minorities, especially in the Baltic area. There should be no double standards here, whether it is taking place in Haiti or in the Baltic area. As a result we adopted a statement with teeth on ensuring human rights, and the President confirmed that he personally would adopt corresponding measures on contacts with the Baltic countries, so that discrimination against the Russian-speaking population there will ultimately be abandoned.

I do not want things to sound too upbeat. That does not reflect the nature of our frank and businesslike conversations. There were, and will be, disagreements. But the main thing is the desire to seek understandings, which is later embodied in specific policies. Such is the flight assignment for the Russian-American partnership. It will be a good replacement for the flight assignment for strategic missiles, which will now not be aimed at one another. Thank you.

Clinton Statement at News Conference

LD1401164094 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0852 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Statement by U.S. President Bill Clinton at news conference in Moscow—live in English with simultaneous translation into Russian; processed from the Russian]

[Text] Thank you very much. Nine months ago, President Yeltsin and I met in Vancouver and there we laid the foundation for the new partnership of the United States and Russia, a partnership based on mutual respect. We have just concluded an excellent and productive summit in which we took important steps to strengthen this partnership. I thank President Yeltsin and all his team for hosting us and for making these days so productive. Throughout our discussions I reaffirmed U.S. firm support of Russia's commitment to democracy and transition to market economy. I informed President Yeltsin that the United States has prepared specific projects worth $1.6 billion of aid, and I announced in Vancouver that we had already expended 70 percent of that sum. The president and I also discussed an additional $2.5 billion in aid for Russia and for other independent states that my administration offered in Tokyo in April, and that the Congress fully funded in September. The president gave me strong assurances of his intention to continue the reform process, and we discussed a number of ways in which the United States and the international community can help in promoting the reforms, and at the same time to assist Russia in cushioning the social hardships which the reform has brought to many people in Russia.

Concrete expression of the assistance of the United States to the reforms is that the United States is opening the doors this year to the Russian small enterprise fund. It has established a fund supporting large enterprises entering the private sector. This fund will be chaired by the former secretary of treasury Michael Blumenthal. We also signed a contract to purchase $12 billion worth of enriched uranium within the next 20 years, and I have asked the Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown to lead a very high-level trade mission to Russia in March, including presidents of major companies who will be in position to promote trade and investment in Russia.

We issued today also a joint statement on human rights, in which we express our common goal to combat discrimination and all forms of racial intolerance, including anti-Semitism.

Today I also had an opportunity to describe further the results of the successful NATO summit this week, and President Yeltsin assured me that Russia will be a full participant in Partnership for Peace.

We took several historic steps to make sure that the fear of nuclear confrontation be in the realm of the past. Presidents Yeltsin and Kravchuk and I signed an agreement which commits Ukraine to scrap approximately 1,500 nuclear warheads, all the most modern and dangerous missiles in Ukraine, the SS-24. The warheads will be removed from those over a period of 10 months.

President Yeltsin and I agreed that as of 30 May, the nuclear missiles of Russia and the United States would not be targetted against any country.

Third we signed an agreement to work closely in those areas where the danger of nuclear weapons proliferation is the greatest, including the Middle East.

We also agreed that the sovereignty and the independence of Russia's neighbors must be respected. I expressed my hope that Russia's talks with Estonia and Latvia would lead to the withdrawal of troops in 1994. As President Yeltsin has said, I agreed that it should be stressed that the rights of the Russian-speaking population should be respected in all areas.

Let me close by reminding you that President Yeltsin and I agreed to meet at the NATO summit in Naples in July, and I am pleased that he accepted my invitation to make a state visit to the United States this fall. I'm looking forward to the meetings.

I came to Europe with the hope of starting to build a new security founded upon a common commitment to democracy, free economics and m[illegible]espect for security and territorial borders. I ca[illegible]h a dream that with the end of the cold war we m[illegible] be able to work together to make a Europe that would be integrated politically, economically and in terms of security. A Europe that for the first time since the establishment of nation states would not be divided by the present conflicts or lingering animosities. I now believe we have a better chance to create that kind of security, a security in which great nations would be able to treat each other as genuine partners, and chart their own futures, without being dictated to by others. A future in which, I believe, greatness would be defined fundamentally by our capacity to enable the men, women and children who live within our borders to live up to the full extent of their capacities.

I thank President Yeltsin for his partnership and endeavor, and I assure you that we will continue to work as hard as we can towards this vision.

Question-Answer Session

LD1401115094 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0858 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Question and answer session of news conference with Russia's President Boris Yeltsin and U.S. President Bill Clinton in Moscow; President Clinton speaks in English with simultaneous Russian translation; individual correspondents identified where possible—live]

[Text] [Terekhov] Hello, I am Terekhov from the INTERFAX news agency. Boris Nikolayevich, you have said repeatedly that you are prepared to take account of the results of the election campaign - the elections which took place on 12 December - and the voters' mood in your domestic policy measures. Do you intend to make any adjustments in your foreign policy, particularly in relations with the United States?

[Yeltsin] I believe that our relations with the United States are developing in a very stable, precisely coordinated fashion, and in a manner that truly befits partners. However, there will of course be a certain adjustment, especially with regard to the social sphere. We consider that, in contrast to Vancouver, we will not bank on the humanitarian sphere and direct social aid. That is our business. What we are asking the American side to do is to open up the American market, to lift restrictions, to help us with our debts, to assist in supporting reforms by helping with the conversion of military enterprises, and so on. We are not asking for direct social aid, because the people of the United States themselves need such social support. It would be simply frivolous to help with unemployment in Russia without guaranteeing employment in their own country.

We think therefore that this is our affair, and from these forms of support, the restructuring of the debt, the structure of changes in the economy, we will begin to look for some kind of social guarantees for our working people in order to reduce poverty, the level of poverty that exists in our country today.

[Gautness] Helen Gautnuss. Do you mean that you are going to retreat from shock therapy a little, to act slightly more moderately in order to help people?

[Yeltsin] No, we shall continue to act in a resolute manner when it comes to reform, and in this respect the President of the United States is agreeable to support such a course.

[Clinton] Could I respond just briefly to the last two questions from my perspective? I commend President Yeltsin for his adherence to continuing the path of economic reforms. If you look at 1993 as compared to 1992, if you consider to what extent the deficit was reduced as a percentage of gross income, if you consider how inflation fell and money stabilized, I think that very good progress has been made in work on including the Russian economy into the global economic system. We had very long talks about what can be done, what kind of assistance the United States could provide to recognize that there are certain difficulties connected with these changes, and to let the Russian people know that efforts are being made to solve these questions.

But I also have to tell you that I believe that people (?will see the benefits) they could not see last year. This year, as investments and trade grow and people in the world see that the president is tackling this issue seriously, I think that advantages will be created. This is linked to developing a system of social support and job training, and all this should be created. I think that this will be a great help in many respects.

In addition, I would like to say in response to your question that, in my view, President Yeltsin has been, it appears, criticized in some quarters for relations with America, the implication being that we are somehow trying to direct the course of Russian policy. This is not true. The people of Russia themselves should determine

their future. The only thing I would like to do is to say that if we share common values, a vision of the future, dreams of political and economic freedom, and respect for neighboring countries, I would like to be an equal partner because I believe that this is a great country, and that the whole world—and Europe in particular—are interested in Russian reforms succeeding. So I must say that our relationships with Russia have been absolutely correct all this time, although some people are trying to characterize them wrongly.

I have come here as a friend and partner. We have our own problems in the country, [passage indistinct]. We should be partners and Russia should determine its own future.

[ITAR-TASS correspondent Sizov] I have a question to both presidents. During the Brussels visit the Russian president and the Russian side addressed NATO and the United States with a request to exert more influence on Ukraine over the issue of nuclear weapons. How far have Russia's hopes been justified with the signing of agreements just now at the talks which have taken place in Moscow with the president of Ukraine? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Well, I think our hopes have been justified extremely quickly. Today an agreement was signed with Ukraine on the destruction of all nuclear weapons in Ukraine and on their transportation to Russia to be destroyed there. Of course, as concerns the uranium, we should offer compensation and give fuel uranium for weapon-grade uranium. We agree with this, since we will also be processing weapon-grade uranium into fuel uranium with American help.

Given that an agreement was signed today on uranium, I believe that today the agreement with Ukraine, the trilateral agreement signed by the three presidents, is a historic decision in which not only Russia but the United States, and U.S. President Bill Clinton personally, have played a major role.

[Clinton] I am fully satisfied with this agreement. I want to compliment President Kravchuk again because I believe he has really shown great interest in obtaining security for his country, which has become stronger and which after this agreement will become stronger economically over the next years, due to the fact that investors will support this decision to be a non-nuclear state. Just like [passage indistinct] this was, after all, President Yeltsin's proposal that we establish this trilateral process. I have enjoyed working on this, we worked on it intensly, Vice President Gore worked on it, and of course our whole team worked on it. I assure you that I will personally continue to work on this intensly. I think that a strong and independent Ukraine is very important for the creation of an integrated Europe, which we are working on in our partnership.

[Unidentified correspondent in English] A question for both presidents. President Yeltsin, you have undertaken today, and President Clinton has agreed, to encourage and continue economic reforms on a large scale, but time demands that institutions be created which can soften the effects of these reforms. The last elections showed that 15 percent of those elected support this policy. How can this policy be continued, bearing in mind the opposition there will be in parliament? President Clinton, without direct aid, what can international institutions do to help President Yeltsin?

[Yeltsin] First of all I do not agree with your figures that 15 percent of Russians support the reforms; that is not true, absolutely not true. It is necesary to see how people voted for the Constitution. The Constitution is the support for the reforms, not individual personalities, not voting for individual parties and blocs, but voting for the Constitution which determines the future of Russia and its reform. This is where the citizens of Russia determined their choice, and that was around 60 percent.

As regards support by world institutions: We talked about this. Incidentally we discussed about 30 or more issues—internal issues, Russian ones, U.S. ones, bilateral relations, international relations, and so on, security issues—a large spectrum of issues. And I believe that, of course, the fact that a package was adopted in Tokyo, and that unfortunately the G-7 has a very inert attitude toward implementing this decision—this is the main thing. [sentence as heard]

Bill Clinton has personally fulfilled his obligations, what he promised in Vancouver. He has practically handed over the first package—1.6 billion. The second package of approximately the same amount, which is passing through Congress, will also be provided in 1994 and 1995. As regards the pledges of the G-7, the seven countries, here unfortunately the situation is significantly more complicated. They made a decision, but there has only been minimum implementation. This pains me, and it also pains my friend, Bill Clinton.

[Clinton] Let me respond to your question. I think it is important to tell you what we are doing. First of all, the agreement on uranium is extremely important. It guarantees a steady stream of commercial...[pauses] It is a business deal. It guarantees that money will be received each year for a long time to come. Now in addition to that, I have asked for $900 million in aid from the 1995 budget, and if you take that together with the 2.5 billion in the second package for all the republics of the former Soviet Union—most of it will go to Russia—there will be more than a billion dollars in aid in each of the next two years.

In addition, we have reached agreement with the G-7 countries on a number of other things which I think will help as well. We are opening an office here headed by an American, a G-7 office to make sure that all the commitments involved are complied with. We are going to work toward trying to get the funds—I am confident we will—to Russia's energy customers, so that they can pay their bills for the energy that Russia is providing. It is a business deal that will give them a considerable amount of money.

We offer technical assistance, all that the president has requested, and we are trying to help to provide for social services, [word indistinct] scenario, and the program for staff training in order to soften the negative consequences of reforms. This week we are again starting to allocate money [words indistinct] to the fund for the development of small enterprises. I would also like to stress that the willingness of President Yeltsin to continue along the path of economic reforms, it seems to me, is viewed positively by the international financial institutions. This will make it possible to free billions of dollars of assistance within the next couple of months for investments.

Following Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown's visit in March, there will be a significant increase in trade and investments on the part of the United States. So we intend to work very hard on this. It seems to me that this will affect [word indistinct] the citizen of Russia. The point is that there is always a gap between the time when a decision is made and the time when people can actually feel the effect of this decision on their lives. This is exactly what I was trying to explain during my walkabout yesterday while shaking hands with Muscovites. All of us who care very much about the potential of this country and the greatness of this country must be interested in this. I think that all this will be felt in the life of the average Russian citizen. I think that this will have a significant effect in the next few years.

[Unidentified correspondent] Vesti, Russian television. Millions of Russian viewers are watching us and smiling. Boris Nikolayevich, I have a question for you. Taking into account the composition of the new Russian Parliament, can one envisage certain problems with the ratification of agreements and accords signed with Western partners? It might be that the Parliament will toughen its foreign policy. Do you, as president of the Russian Federation, feel that the situation restricts and complicates your relations with the United States and its allies in the face of this fact?

[Yeltsin] I do not think we have that sort of Parliament. This Parliament is wiser, more intellectual, and more experienced. I believe that the upper chamber will, generally speaking, pursue the line taken by the president and the Government, while the State Duma will gradually reach that position and realize that to drag out and fail to ratify major international treaties and agreements—such as that concerning the destruction of chemical weapons and so on—is simply to show disrespect for their own people. I also hope that the members of Parliament will remember, as I said in my message, that they are envoys of the people and that the people have told them how they ought to behave. They ought to conduct themselves with a high standard of political culture. Of course, our parliamentary system is young, but I believe nevertheless that it will operate constructively.

[Bennett] Nancy Bennett from AP. President Clinton, what are your impressions after experiencing Moscow firsthand? What is your assessment of the threat the ultra-nationalist movement poses to the movement for democracy?

[Clinton] Well, those who are in the Parliament are, after all, there as a result of democracy. I think these are two separate things, because you have to respect the democratic process and in every democratic process no one is satisfied with the outcome of all elections, I can tell you that. In that sense, I do not think they present a threat to the democratic process. Now I think what is happening here is that Russia, which is and has been a very great country for a very long time, is doing what countries are required to do at some point or other—I mean redefining what greatness means and creating a vision for the future. When times are difficult, and the Russian people have been through some difficult times, there are always, in every age and time, people who can generate some support by defining greatness in terms of the past. But in the end, the only people who achieve real success are those who define greatness in terms of the future. That is why I believe that the reformist movement will prevail. If you look at the nature of the global economy, and if you look at the processes that move and change people's lives, I think history has always sided with the reformers. I also believe what would happen is that you can have some interesting discussions in that Duma, and I keenly follow the news at the moment. It is nice to be in a place where some other president is having problems with his parliament. [laughter]

President Yeltsin has made an important point here: When these issues are discussed, and when you move from the rhetoric of the campaign, which is always abstract, to the real problems of real people, there is a possibility of a new consensus emerging. The only thing that I would say to all the people in this new Duma is that you have enormous opportunities and responsibility. You are the first ones in your country to be elected constitutionally and democratically. You must be ready to listen to Russia and to tackle issues. I would not think that America and other countries should dramatize it. I think it is a start of a great and exiting path, and we should wish you all the best and see what happens.

[Moderator Kostikov] The protocol circumstances force us to reduce the time of the news conference. So, one last question each from the Russian and American sides. Go ahead, Markov, RIA-Novosti.

[Markov] Vladimir Markov, Russian Information Agency-Novosti. I would like you to make your point of view, Boris Nikolayevich, and yours, President Clinton, more specific as regards the latest decisions of the NATO Council on the possible eventual entry of other states into the organization, particularly those that are contiguous with Russia. Do you see the possibility of Russia itself ever joining NATO, and on what terms?

[Yeltsin] I think that the initiative of President Bill Clinton and some Europeans not to accept anyone into NATO country by country, but to declare everyone

partners in order to preserve peace and security, is a good formula, since drawing one more line, dividing once again into black and white as the saying goes, is no good. It is another matter that the moment will come, at some time, when possibly both Russia and all the others will unite, but precisely together, in one packet as people say, and that will then ensure security for everyone. I am also against dismemberment one by one, and for that reason I very actively support the initiative of the U.S. President as regards Partnership for Peace.

[Clinton] The whole idea behind the Partnership for Peace was to develop a post-Cold War mechanism for countries that share the same commitments—in this case a commitment to respect the territorial borders of their neighbors, a commitment to civilian control over the military, a commitment to joint planning and training and military exercise—that these countries could work together aiming towards eventual NATO membership, if they so wish, and if that is the direction that appears to be the best for security of the post-Cold War world. That is, NATO members clearly foresaw this possibility of such an expansion, but this Partnership for Peace is a real thing now, and even now we are inviting everyone, we have invited all the former Soviet republics, all the Warsaw Pact nations and the other non-NATO members in Europe, to be part of the Partnership for Peace.

All were told that this would also lead to eventual membership in NATO, but our objective is to create for the first time in the history of nation states, an undivided, united Europe, united around political freedom, economic freedom, military cooperation and respect for one another's borders—something that has never happened before. I think we share that vision, and I think that we have a particular responsibility to work towards that vision.

[Moderator Kostikov] This will be the last question. Rita Braver, CBS.

[Braver] President Clinton, did you discuss the subject of Bosnia and what was the nature of this discussion? Does President Yeltsin agree with NATO's stated intention of carrying out air strikes if the situation does not improve in Sarajevo and Bosnia?

[Clinton] First I asked the NATO representatives, my NATO colleagues, to discuss this question with great precision. I want to describe with great precision what they voted for. They voted to reaffirm that air strikes could be considered if Sarajevo is in very great danger, in the sense that the United Nations is unable to work in Bosnia, if the United Nations is unable to work in Sarajevo, if there are no hospitals, if there is no humanitarian aid, medicines, and so on. They voted to ask the armed forces to consider what can be done on the basis of the air force in order to help the transfer of troops from Srebrenica and the opening of Tuzla for humanitarian aims.

I would like to stress this because there is great understanding and a resolution directly aimed at creating a peace treaty for Bosnia. All of this is aimed at helping the UN mission and also to preserve people's lives until the sides conclude measures.

I think that I should probably allow President Yeltsin to speak for himself about what NATO has done with regard to Bosnia. We have different points of view on Bosnia. Yesterday evening we discussed whether there is anything else our sides can do independently or together to put an end to this conflict; that is, we want people to stop killing each other and conclude a sensible peace under which they can live normally, even if just for their children's sake. We did not reach any final results. Quite a frank conversation took place and several things were said and I think that we can work together.

A more detailed account may give rise to a central hope. I think that we had a very honest and frank conversation. [passage indistinct] It is very important because these air strikes have become a sort of psychological test. NATO enumerated three possible spheres of military actions. All of this aimed at helping the UN mission. This cannot, in the final analysis, resolve the conflict. The NATO leaders said that in the final analysis the sides must, themselves, reach agreement on this. President Yeltsin and I discussed whether we can do anything to help a possible decision. We reached no final results but a basis was created for further discussions.

[Moderator Kostikov] Thank you, gentlemen, the news conference is over. Thank you. Goodbye.

[Clinton] Boris said he agreed with my characterization of our conversation.

[Yeltsin] If you are dissatisfied because I did not reply, well, in the first place, you put your question to President Clinton and not to me. But to touch on my opinion, then we really did have a discussion. There are some differences between us but, as I said in my speech, we are not in agreement on everything and everywhere. We really do have differences, but the most important thing is that there was goodwill, there was partnership to find common decisions, and I believe that we shall find common decisions. Thank you.

Clinton on Russia's Role in 'Partnership for Peace'

LD1401180494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1642 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Agureyev]

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—"Russian can play a critical role (in "Partnership for Peace")," President Clinton said in an exclusive interview with ITAR-TASS on Friday [14 January]. He was speaking straight after addressing the Russian people from the Ostankino Television studios.

Clinton said Russia could do its part "in two ways - first of all, the Russian military are still one of the best

trained and best armed militaries in the world. So, for Russia and the United States to participate means all these other military armies, particularly from the smaller countries, get a chance to do planning, and training, and actual exercises at a much higher level, than they would otherwise.

"In other words, it's a big thing. It increases the capacity of their armed forces and their sense of security.

"Also, if Russia joins the "Partnership for Peace", one of the conditions for joining is saying, "We promise to be good neighbors. We respect the terrritorial boundaries of all the other countries in the "Partnership for Peace". So it takes away one of the big fears that you hear in some countries or in the Baltics or wherever. [no end quotation mark as received]

Responding to a question about what impressions of Russia he will take home, the President said, "I think it's a wonderful country and I have had a wonderful trip. And I think you're going to have a great future. I know this is a tough time, but you'll work through it. You'll figure it out."

Kozyrev, Christopher Sign Agreement on Radiation Study

LD1401152994 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1509 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher have signed here today, after the third round of the Russo-American summit talks, an agreement on cooperation in studying radiation aftereffects with a view to minimise radioactive pollution hazards to human health and the environment.

The purpose of this document is to lay the foundations for close and long-term cooperation in studying radiation hazards to human health and to the environment.

Russia and the United States will jointly study the aftermaths of the exposure of humans to ionising radiations, will organise the collection and processing of data on radiation hazards, will study the environment, and will conduct corresponding scientific research.

A joint coordination committee will be set up to study the after-effects of radiation. The document notes that the sides shall ensure an adequate and effective protection of intellectual property, created or handed over under the current agreement, and conclude corresponding accords on its implementation.

The agreement will remain in force for five years, subject to repeated prolongation for the same term.

'Official Dinner' Held for Clinton 14 Jan

Clinton Delivers Toast

LD1401203094 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1916 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Jan—U.S. President Bill Clinton, while addressing President Yeltsin and his wife Naina Yeltsin at an official dinner in the Faceted Hall of the Moscow Kremlin, pointed out that Russia's revival is due, to a great extent, to the Russian president. The U.S. leader said that "under your leadership Russia is building a market economy," and that "this great multiethnic democratic state is being cemented with the ideals of freedom and trust."

Bill Clinton went on to say that "yesterday I visited the Kazan Cathedral. The ancient church was recently rebuilt from new materials but nevertheless, its stands on its ancient foundations. It is exactly the same with Russia, Mr. President, which is creating a new society, yet it has its roots in the greatness of your history and your people."

Raising a glass to the Russian president, Bill Clinton proposed a toast "with deep respect and admiration to the great peoples of Russia and the United States and to the bright and firm prospects of freedom which enlightens our common future."

'Text' of Yeltsin's Toast

LD1401200694 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1936 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin spoke at the state dinner given in honor of U.S. President Bill Clinton and his wife, Hillary, in the Kremlin Hall of Facets Friday evening. Follows the full text of his toast:

"Mr. President, Mrs. Clinton, dear guests, ladies and gentlemen,

I think you will agree with me in saying that these last days brought a special meaning to our life and activity. The world is watching the events in Russia. Amid the stormy political developments which dominate Moscow's current life, the visit of the president of the United States of America nonetheless attracted particularly close attention.

Our meeting testifies to the fact that Russia is concerned not only with its own problems, but feels itself an integral part of the world community, and shares in the world's anxieties and hopes.

Time flies unbelievably fast during official visits. Literally all of the available time is scheduled, and we, Mr. President, have succeeded in making the utmost use of every minute. The key is not only in the fact that the visit was thoroughly prepared in advance. Most importantly,

both the Russian and American sides had a sincere desire to reach a mutual understanding and give our partnership a new, global scope.

Each of our discussions with President Clinton was direct and honest. We spoke about the most important problems and didn't shun acute issues, looking for unconventional solutions to them. This, I believe, is the way of both the Russian and American peoples.

The ground-breaking results of the Russian-American summit in Moscow are not the only reason why this day is important. Russia celebrates January 14 as the first day of the New Year, according to the Russian Orthodox calendar. We have always observed this day, even in the hardest times.

In line with Russian tradition, I would like to wish our American guests and all those present good health and well-being in the new year. The year that has begun is new for Russia in every sense of the word. The country has entered this year with a new constitution which meets modern, civilized standards. The Federal Assembly, elected by free and democratic vote, has begun its work. In these past elections, the citizens of Russia reaffirmed their commitment to internal peace and stability, democracy, and Russia's renewal.

Along with this, it is as clear as always that all developments in Russia are of vital importance for the whole world. Now we need to be sincerely supportive of each other's success, since the resolution of Russia's problems is a key factor in achieving global stability and confirming the basic values of the modern world.

It is not enough to mouth these values. It is necessary to bring one's actions into line with them in order to achieve tangible results. Only then will the recognition of these values in every country lead to the success of the entire world community.

Life in a free and democratic society must be better both for the common people of every single nation, and for the whole world community. This is not only about upholding ideals, but also about providing people with everything necessary for a worthy life. This goal cannot be attained without pooling our efforts, without defining our partnership in practical terms. Together we shall overcome. To me, this famous phrase means that only together can we ensure the triumph of freedom everywhere in the world and, most importantly, in the hearts of the people who live in it.

We appreciate the active role played by the present U.S. Administration in mobilising international support for Russian reforms. But of course, we would welcome the further intensification of these efforts. Economic interaction is now moving to the centre of the Russian-American partnership in all its diversity.

It is necessary to speed up the implementation of the Tokyo Accords. It is very important for us to have a respite in repaying our external debt. We want fair access to the American and world markets, an expansion of trade and investments, and assistance to Russia in creating the infrastructure needed for a civilized market economy.

Ever more people in our countries are now keeping an eye on the rouble exchange rate against the dollar and the dynamics of stocks and shares on exchange markets in Moscow and New York. This is an encouraging sign of our transition to a normal, civilized financial system.

I can say more: For the first time, it is now becoming possible to form long-term, diversified links between our two economies. This is a reliable foundation on which to build our strategic partnership. The prospect of creating a free trade zone between the two countries deserves special attention.

On the whole, a variety of bilateral ties between Russia and the United States is now being actively developed.

The Russian-American dialogue is increasingly centering around relatively new problems, including the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery-vehicles, regional arms races, as well as outbursts of nationalism and other kinds of extremism.

All this does not mean, of course, that there are no problems in the Russian-American relationship. But the main thing is that both we and the Americans consider the solution to these problems attainable through dialogue in which both sides are equally interested and which is based on commonality of our long-term national interests.

In closing, I would like to recall the words of the far-sighted traveller and thinker Alexis de Tocqueville, who wrote more than 150 years ago that there are two great nations in the world at present, which began their movement from different starting points, but seem to be progressing towards the same objective. I mean the Russians and the Americans. Their origin is different, and their paths are dissimilar, but nevertheless both appear to be among God's chosen nations.

History has offered us a unique chance to realize the full potential of partnership and friendship between our two great states. Democratic Russia is ready to make full use of this potential. Permit me to propose a toast to the health of the President of the United States and his wife and to the well-being and prosperity of the American and Russian peoples."

Further on 'Official' Kremlin Dinner

LD1401202494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1950 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—An official dinner in honor of U.S. President Bill Clinton and his wife Hillary was given tonight in candlelight in the Kremlin's Palace of Facets by President Boris Yeltsin and his wife Naina.

The presidents and their wives were seated at the central table near U.S. State Secretary Warren Christopher, Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and his wife.

A toast of Boris Yeltsin noted history has given to Russia and the United States a unique chance to make their great possibilities come true. The Russian president raised the toast to welfare and prosperity of the two peoples. He congratulated the U.S. guests with New Year marked today on the Orthodox calendar.

In his turn, Bill Clinton wished the Russian people and president health and happiness.

The dinner offered champagne, Stolichnaya Vodka, Armenian cognacs, white and red wines, Russian cuisine, including caviar, salmon and shchi, Russian cabbage soup.

The official dinner finished with a concert of choreographic and music groups of Russia in Kremlin's St. George Hall.

Yeltsin Gives Farewell Address to President Clinton

LD1501071894 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0625 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Speech by President Boris Yeltsin at a farewell ceremony for U.S. President Bill Clinton at the Kremlin in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. President of the United States, esteemed Mrs. Clinton, esteemed members of the U.S. delegation:

The first official visit by the U.S. President to Russia is drawing to a close. I want to express my opinion that this visit has been extremely successful. It has demonstrated once again that we must indeed be partners and must deepen that partnership. We must indeed live together on this small planet and try to ensure peace and security, not only in our two countries but throughout the world.

I thank you, Mr. President, for taking advantage of the opportunity and for getting to know the people of Russia, the people of Moscow—in the streets, in shops, at Ostankino, and in other places—and for seeing for yourself that the people want reform and for seeing that the people want freedom and democracy.

I think that you have obtained a better knowledge of the people of Russia during the visit, and the people of Russia now have a better idea of the President of the United States of America.

I want to wish you bon voyage on your return journey, happiness to your families, and prosperity to America and the American people.

Clinton Accompanied by Chernomyrdin

LD1501070694 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0644 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Excerpt] Moscow, 15 Jan—[passage omitted] The U.S. President and his wife left the Kremlin for Vnukovo II airport. They are being accompanied by Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. Bill Clinton will be flying to Minsk.

Clinton Departs Moscow for Minsk

LD1501080494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0759 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Vladimir Taranov]

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—U.S. President Bill Clinton and his wife have just left here by air for Minsk at the close of a three-day official visit to Russia.

The chief result of the Russian-U.S. talks in Moscow is in the signing of a Moscow declaration by the two presidents, the declaration which reaffirmed the importance of Russian-U.S. cooperation for global stability, as well as in a joint Russo- American-Ukrainian agreement on the removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine's territory. The agreement became a breakthrough in the field of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In all, 12 bilateral documents were adopted during the summit.

White House Official Sums Up Results of Summit

LD1501005894 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1812 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 14 Jan—U.S. President Bill Clinton's visit to Moscow was packed with important talks, meetings with public and political figures, and protocol events. [passage omitted]

At a routine briefing today, a high-ranking White House spokesman, who asked not to be named, summed up the preliminary results of the Moscow summit. He said that President Bill Clinton had fulfilled the tasks before him: to confirm partnership relations between the United States and Russia that were established in Vancouver, to express firm support by the United States for the economic and political reforms in Russia, and also to develop ties with a wider spectrum of political forces in the country.

According to the briefer, the main themes of the talks in Moscow were economic reforms in Russia, the "Partnership for Peace" program, and also disarmament. The White House spokesman said that the most important

event was, perhaps, the signing this morning of a trilateral agreement between Russia, Ukraine, and the United States on eliminating nuclear weapons deployed on Ukrainian territory.

He said also that the leaders of both countries had discussed both yesterday and today the question of the presence of Russian troops in Latvia and Estonia. "We think that progress has been made in this area and very much hope that agreements on troop withdrawal will be concluded soon between Russia and Latvia and between Russia and Estonia," the White House spokesman said.

Kozyrev Notes 'Absence of a Sensation'

LD1501172094 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1457 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] As Russia's Foreign Minister Kozyrev reported to Interfax on Saturday [15 Jnauary], President Yeltsin's return visit to U.S. was scheduled for autumn this year.

Turning back to the Russo-American summit in Moscow, he noted that its main task to hold it in the conditions of mature partnership was completed. "The main sensation of the summit is the absence of a sensation. We are proceeding to institutional and systematic partnership," Kozyrev stressed.

In his opinion, the Moscow meeting marked a stage in the development of smooth Russo-American trade. He singled out "the uranium bargain" as supplementary to the space deal and said that both contracts covered a long period (10-15years) and could fetch billions in profit.

He noted that in Moscow the presidents also discussed economic partnership. "In economics, partnership means something other than a short-term credit or a portion of humanitarian aid. It's day-to- day work to integrate markets in international systems rather than to "patch up a hole." It means negotiations with a long prospective and realization that Russia is a great economic power. That's precisely what was done at the Moscow summit, Kozyrev said.

He specifically stressed that "least of all" did he regard the Russo-American-Ukrainian understandings as the chief result of President Clinton's visit to Russia.

The agreements concerning the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine "are important, but they will bear fruit only during their implementation. There is nothing new in these accords," he said.

Kozyrev recalled the signing of similar accords with Ukraine. "At a CIS summit in Almaty two years ago, an agreement was signed to oblige Ukraine to follow Belarus and Kazakhstan in becoming a nuclear- free country and remove weapons... Then, numerous meetings followed in Crimea, Moscow, Kiev, etc. Interaction on this problem with Americans is nothing new either since the Lisbon protocol was signed with U.S participation."

Nonetheless, Kozyrev hopes that now when the accords are fixed at the level of Russian, American, and Ukrainian presidents, they will yield result. "All of us are full of optimism. It would be strange, if the agreements, signed by the presidents, remained on paper," he noted.

Yeltsin Adviser Hails Success of Summit

LD1701162294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1609 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin's top adviser academician Andranik Migranyan hailed the success of the U.S.-Russian summit meeting that was held in Moscow last week.

Commenting on the achievements of the summit meeting Migranyan said that "the president of Russia admitted the need to seek a new architecture of European security, saying that the partnership for peace concept born within the NATO is not the only possibility." By this he indirectly admitted the need to establish such a system of European security in which all countries of eastern Europe would have equal rights in adopting decisions to maintain peace and stability, the academician said.

Secondly, the U.S. side confirmed "Russia's special role in maintaining stability on the territory of the post-Soviet space," Migranyan said, referring to the U.S.-Russian-Ukrainian agreement to eliminate Ukrainian nuclear weapons.

Additionally, "the U.S. President went further than making declarations and or giving advice, he concluded concrete agreements with Russia to open the American market to Russian goods and include russia into the GATT as an equal member," as well as integrate it into other international financial and economic structures.

The academician also welcomed Clinton's decision to help defend the rights of Russian minorities in the Baltic states.

Outcome of Yeltsin-Clinton Meeting Assessed

MK1501111094 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Dmitriy Gornostayev report in the "Summit Meeting" column: "The Expression of Support and Gratitude. In Addition to This, the Yeltsin-Clinton Meeting Also Has Some Other Results"]

[Text] The just concluded meeting between the Russian and U.S. Presidents has not brought anything new in the relations between these two countries. Bill Clinton's expressions of support for Boris Yeltsin and his course toward economic reforms have been heard from across the ocean ever since the moment when Yeltsin himself started talking about them. The presidents did not report anything sensational at their final press conference, like

what they agreed on in Vancouver or at the Tokyo G-7 meeting. The Moscow summit with respect to Russian-U.S. relations can be described as working, regular, and transient rather than historic. Were it not for the issue of the Ukrainian nuclear weapons and yesterday's signing of the Russian-Ukrainian-U.S. agreement on their abolition, Clinton's visit to Moscow would not have justified the usual expectations of a meeting between the presidents of great powers.

An exception here might be a $12 billion contract signed yesterday in Moscow on the sale of Russian weapons-grade uranium to the United States over a period of 20 years which will be processed into nuclear power plant fuel with U.S. assistance. But this question too could have been dealt with during the visit to Russia by Vice President Albert Gore, which was precisely of an economic character.

Yet the latest meeting of the presidents has its own results which are perhaps worth elaboration. The most outstanding among them may be the accord on lifting most of the discriminatory economic restrictions on Russian goods entering the U.S. market. This is far more important for the prestige of the Russian Federation than the reception of economic aid packages some of which—for instance, the Tokyo one last July—are allocated only in word. Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin at the final press conference with his U.S. counterpart Bill Clinton stressed that Russia needs full-fledged collaboration with the West, not "humanitarian aid." Therefore, by renouncing the status of a state being dragged out of the mire of economic crisis by others, Russia is putting itself in the same rank with the developed countries. This is also evident from Yeltsin's words, which showed that he sees the prospect of G-7 soon turning into G-8. Possibly this will happen in July at the G-7 Naples summit to which the Russian president has been invited.

He told journalists that relations between Russia and the United States "have been developing in a stable and partner-like manner," but they need adjustment, especially in the social sphere. Russia is not expecting direct social assistance from the United States because, according to Yeltsin, "such support is needed by the United States itself": It is impossible to help Russia overcome unemployment without having overcome its own unemployment in the first place.

Touching on this social issue, Boris Yeltsin thus apparently sought to hedge against possible attacks on the part of a number of opposition forces in parliament who are accusing him of lacking a social security policy. Furthermore, the president uttered a seemingly flattering phrase with respect to the parliamentarians: "I do not think that we have a bad parliament. It is more intelligent and more intellectual, and with great experience. The upper chamber will follow the president's line and the State Duma will come around to that." Although it was spoken in linkage to the issue of ratification of international treaties, Boris Yeltsin apparently also had the domestic aspect in mind. The implication behind this phrase is approximately as follows: "I am commending you and you should learn to listen to me. If you do, I shall praise you again."

The joint statement by the Russian and U.S. Presidents on securing human and ethnic minority rights, which primarily applies to the Baltic countries, was fairly important but unfortunately little more than a mere declaration. Boris Yeltsin described this statement as "having teeth." After its concessions to Moscow on the issue of NATO expansion the United States has once again shown who is more important for it. And here, judging by how feebly Clinton agreed with Yeltsin's statements at the press conference, presumably there was some pressure involved there. In the situation of misunderstanding that has developed between Russia and the Baltic republics, the White House has in the end taken the Kremlin's side.

As for NATO, by inviting the East European countries into the Partnership for Peace, the North Atlantic alliance, according to Clinton, is giving a chance to all of them to become full-fledged members of this structure. Today the Partnership for Peace will be conducive to preventing a division of Europe and Russia's separation from it.

Both Clinton and Yeltsin noted that there have been disagreements in the course of the talks. But at the press conference only one such issue cropped up on which the presidents hold different points of view—the conflict in Bosnia and the possibility of bombing it with NATO forces. On this problem the heads of the two states did not come to agreement but, in Clinton's words, a frank conversation on this subject created the foundation for future discussions.

Apparently fearing "embarrassing" questions, especially after the words about disagreements between the two friends, Vyacheslav Kostikov, the Russian Federation president's press secretary, gave no opportunity to representatives of Russian newspapers to ask any questions. Journalists from third countries were also denied this possibility.

So, it can be stated that the main result of Bill Clinton's visit to Moscow has been the signing of the trilateral agreement on the destruction of Kiev's nuclear weapons. Importantly, on Yeltsin's initiative. As for Russian-U.S. bilateral relations, there have been no particularly outstanding moves. But then, where is one supposed to move as long as things in this respect are as good as they can possibly be: President Boris Yeltsin is friendly with Bill Clinton and the people of the Russian Federation with the people of the United States.

'Chief Result' Noted

LD1501143894 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1239 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS news analyst Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—The importance of U.S. President Bill Clinton's official visit to Russia on January 13-15 was outlined in the most general form in remarks made by his Russian counterpart Boris Yeltsin at a joint news conference in the Kremlin: the two powers' relationhip have finally entered the stage of mature strategic global partnership in very respect.

This originated during the Vancouver summit in April last year. It was not fortuitous that the word "Vancouver" was pronounced repeatedly in Moscow these days. And still, the Moscow dialogue of the two presidents has its own value: intentions and promises predominated last year, whereas this time the two sides stated that they begin to work.

This is of importance in itself because not every intention gets rapidly translated into life, which has been evidenced, in the opinion of the Russian side, by its experience of contacts with the Group of Seven (G7) as a whole. Out of all G-7 leaders, Boris Yeltsin believes, only Bill Clinton fulfilled all his promises to Russia.

Mr Cliton also attained the goals of his current trip, according to his own estimates: To reaffirm partnership relations between the U.S. and Russia and express U.S. support for economic and political reforms in Russia. Singled out among subjects of discussion can be economic reforms in Russia, a European security system in the post- cold-war era, disarmament, and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Partnership is the leading idea of the Moscow declaration—the central document signed by the two presidents. It is stated in the declaration in particular that "the two presidents announced that they would direct the detargeting of strategic nuclear missiles under their respective commands so that by not later than May 30, 1994 those missiles will not be targeted. Thus, for the time in nearly half a century, virtually since the dawn of the nuclear age, Russia and the United States will not operate nuclear forces, day- to-day, in a manner that presumes they are adversaries."

In a joint statement, the two presidents undertook jointly to seek ways to strengthen guarantees of security for states which renounced the possession of nuclear weapons and strictly observe their obligations.

The January 14 signing of a Russo-american-Ukrainian agreement on the removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine's Territory became a real breakthrough in this respect. President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine, who had arrived in Moscow by air expressly for this purpose, described this as a historic moment.

Ukraine in actual fact agreed to become a non-nuclear country. In exchange for that, Kiev received guarantees of security and compensation for getting rid of nuclear arms in the form of fuel- grade uranium which Russia together with the U.s. will produce by processing weapon-grade uranium, and the removal of obstacles to the development of Ukraine's economic relations with foreign countries.

Support for Russian reforms was, perhaps, the principal aim of Bill Clinton's mission. Only provided there is a stable and democratic Russia with a free economy, it is possible to build a new world order in the post-cold-war era on the basis of those values which are close to America and other civilised nations.

Previously, Washington declared its support for the liberalisation of the Russian economy in general—the quicker the better. This time Bill Clinton placed social problems related to the transition to a free market economy almost in the centre of attention.

Although Clinton, during the Ostankino teleshow, jokingly remarked that he was not going to give up Alaska, in response to pronouncements by another well-known hero of live broadcasts, everything seems to indicate that the leader of the country with the classical liberal economy has come to realise the essence of the problem: disregard for social welfare development may cost one dear.

Mutual understanding was also reached to the effect that Russia does not count on U.S. direct assistance in this respect but suggests opening the U.S. market to Russian commodities and technologies and lifting trade restrictions, proceeding from the assumption that Russia itself, according to Boris Yeltsin, will seek ways to resolve social problems upon effecting an economic restructuring.

Among the 12 documents adopted during the summit, there are those which mark the beginning of the removal of cold-war obstructions in the trade-and-economic sphere.

With the consent of other countries concerned, the U.S. announced the Export Control Committee (COCOM)—the body which hindered the export of high technologies to Russia—would be dissolved not later than March 31. Discriminatory restrictions on the export of Russian uranium have been iifted.

The understanding of the role of Russia as a great power, the position of which has a decisive influence on the development of events in the world, on peace and security, also manifested itself in the fact that the U.S. president brought with him to Moscow the "Partnership for Peace" concept which had been endorsed by NATO leaders during the Brussels summit. The day before in Prague, those former Warsaw Pact countries which seek to join NATO as soon as possible had also agreed with the concept.

Boris Yeltsin supported the concept which makes it possible to avoid the division of Europe again into two camps but this time along the border of the former Soviet Union. America's reaffirmation of the role of Russia as a great power also manifested itself in the fact

that the influential group of seven economically most developed countries may soon become G-8. Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton will meet next time precisely at a G-7 summit in Naples in July.

The problem of Russia's relations with the Baltic states was discussed as well. Although a joint Russian-U.S. statement on human rights contains rather general formulas, Bill Clinton publicly warned "other countries" that they should respect the rights of ethnic Russians and with this end in view promised to have talks with the leaders of Latvia and Estonia. In response, Washington expects that those states and Russia Conclude agreements as soon as possible on the withdrawal of Russian troops from there.

Of course, a lot of differences were revealed during the Russian- U.S. summit talks, in views on a settlement of the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina in particular. But the two presidents pointed out that there was a basis and goodwill to look for joint solutions. Herein is the chief result of the Moscow summit.

'New Flight Plans' for ICBM's, Russian-U.S. Relations

PM1701112194 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Report by Vladimir Kuzar and Mikhail Pogorelyy: "New 'Flight Plan' for Russia and the United States"]

[Excerpt] The second working day of U.S. President Bill Clinton's official visit to Russia began, by the normal standards of diplomatic protocol, uncommonly early. Even before the talks in the Kremlin, the U.S. head of state paid his respects to the great people who saved humanity from fascism—Bill Clinton laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Aleksandrovskiy Garden by the Kremlin Wall.

Then an extremely intense work session began. The third and final round of the Russian-U.S. summit talks took place in the Yekaterinskiy Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace. On the Russian side, Army General Pavel Grachev, Russian Federation defense minister, took part in the talks together with other delegation members. This enables us conclude that the subject under discussion was Russian-U.S. military-political cooperation. One aspect of this was the retargeting of both countries' strategic nuclear missiles. On this issue, it was announced, a mutually acceptable understanding had been reached.

At the subsequent joint news conference, President Boris Yeltsin announced among other things that new flight plans had been prepared not just for the missiles (which in itself would have been a major sensation just a couple of years ago), but for the whole complex of Russian-U.S. relations. They will become partners on the global strategic level.

It is precisely the fact that his intentions are sincere, together with the fact that he is firmly protecting his own interests, that seems to explain the persistence of President Clinton's mediation efforts to settle the Russian-Ukrainian crisis with regard to the nuclear missile problem. The agreement signed after the trilateral meeting in Moscow guarantees that the missiles stationed in Ukraine will finally be dismantled and that the warheads will be transported to Russia to be destroyed. All the work involved in eliminating the third most powerful nuclear complex in the world should be completed in record time—10 months. It is true that a specific schedule for withdrawing nuclear warheads from Ukrainian territory has not yet been published in accordance with the mutual agreement of the parties involved. [passage omitted]

'Mature Strategic Global Partnership' With U.S.

PM1701112994 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Pavel Shinkarenko report: "Aim Was To 'Get a Result.' That Is Why Results Are Impressive. This Was How Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton Assessed Their Talks in Moscow"]

[Text] All's well that ends well. In accordance with this Russian popular saying, the participants in the Russian-U.S. summit completed their dialogue with a whole range of joint documents. As Boris Yeltsin said at the press conference, the aim was to "get a result."

The list of agreements and statements signed indicates that relations between Moscow and Washington have now indeed entered the phase of mature strategic global partnership in all spheres. The fundamental element in this partnership is enshrined in particular in the Moscow Declaration signed by the presidents, which, as Boris Yeltsin said, "reflects and enshrines the historical improvement in Russian-U.S. relations in Eurasia and the world as a whole." The two countries' cooperation in strengthening strategic stability and security is also given new substance. "A milestone that it proved possible to overcome in Moscow was the adoption of a decision leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons in Ukraine," Boris Yeltsin said. He described this decision by the Russian, U.S., and Ukrainian presidents as an "historic document from which everyone stands to gain, particularly the Ukrainian people." The accord on eliminating nuclear weapons in Ukraine saves money, removes disagreements, sets other countries a good example, and bolsters the Russian-U.S. statement on the nonproliferation of mass-destruction weapons.

The lofty assessment of the "Partnership for Peace" initiative adopted at the NATO Council in Brussels recently was also evidence of the harmony between Russia and the United States. Bill Clinton briefed his Russian partners at the talks on the content of this initiative. The Russian president pointed out that this initiative contains the "beginnings of Russian-U.S. joint

activity." It precludes the argument of unequal security and the possibility of new demarcation lines forming "from Vancouver to Vladivostok." The Russian side sees this idea as "one, but not, of course, the only scenario for the development of a new Europe." Yeltsin expressed willingness to "fill this channel for cooperation with concrete substance." The U.S. President also agreed to that approach. "I came to Europe in the hope of starting to build new security based on a common commitment to democracy, a free economy, and mutual respect for security and territorial borders," he said at a press conference. "I dream of Europe being politically and economically integrated from the security viewpoint." Bill Clinton confirmed that the United States wants "to be an equal partner in relations with Russia." Backing Boris Yeltsin's reformist course, particularly in the social sphere, and noting that Russia is a great country, the U.S. President said that "the whole world and Europe want Russia to be successful in its reforms."

The concerted approach was also backed up by specific actions. The heads of the two states made pointed statements in support of human rights and on nuclear weapons nonproliferation, while the leaders of the foreign policy departments ratified with their signatures several agreements improving cooperation between the two countries in the sphere of public health, environmental protection, and air transport, as well as a memorandum on export controls.

Results of Clinton's Europe Tour Summed Up

PM1701092794 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Yevgeniy Popov article: "Results of U.S. President Bill Clinton's European Tour. Back Again Empty-Handed"]

[Text] So far Clinton has not been too lucky in the field of international policy. Admittedly, this is no longer giving rise to pointed remarks as it did at the beginning of his presidency: It was said that all his knowledge had been acquired at the international club of blini lovers. But so far the U.S. President has not won any laurels in this field.

His first European trip to Brussels, Prague, Kiev, Moscow, Minsk, and Geneva was evidently undertaken in order to, first, enhance and strengthen the U.S. President's international prestige and, second, once again demonstrate support for B.N. Yeltsin, of which the Russian president is permanently in need.

The problem is, however, that these aims are to a considerable extent mutually contradictory and this became clear during the first stage of Clinton's European marathon. In Brussels he made public the new U.S. "Partnership for Peace" concept. The package of measures—as always bedecked in a fine propaganda wrapper—comprises a program for the phased integration in NATO of the East European countries that were formerly members of the Warsaw Pact.

The North Atlantic military alliance was at one time propagandized in the West as a strictly defensive alliance and its very existence and strengthening was attributed to the existence of the "Soviet threat." You would have thought that after the elimination of the Warsaw Pact and the self-destruction of the Soviet Union, after the United States was left as the world's only superpower, NATO should have disbanded immediately—being totally redundant. Especially since, according to this military bloc's strategists, NATO no longer has any enemies and Russia is now regarded as a friendly democratic power. But they are not even thinking about dissolving NATO! The United States is leaving its 100,000-strong expeditionary corps in Europe. What is more, the latest phase in the policy of "rolling back" and forcing Russia out of its traditional spheres of influence is beginning in its new geopolitical form.

The White House administration has already declared NATO's rapprochement with the countries of East Europe and their subsequent integration within the military bloc as a "highly important aspect of U.S. security." NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner does not conceal the fact that: "In the future the countries of the former Warsaw Pact will be given a seat in NATO. It is just a matter of time."

But at the moment Washington is maneuvering, preferring to use the well-known sophistic method of describing as half-empty a glass that is half-full and giving Yeltsin the opportunity to do the same.

U.S. General Shalikashvili said: "We cannot simply move the Berlin wall several hundred kilometers eastward." This cannot be done "simply"—there are not only organizational-technical, but also psychological difficulties!

Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev issued an exploratory statement: Russia may also decide to join NATO. To which Polish President Walesa responded that he would support this decision on one condition—that Russia hands its nuclear arsenal over to NATO control.

That is quite possibly what NATO strategists already want! A few days ago Deutsche Welle reported a curious information leak from NATO's Brussels headquarters: U.S. Secretary of Defense Les Aspin suggested a concept, which presupposes "measures including air and missile raids on arms production sites." There was no reference to Russia and the concept has not hitherto won official approval, but you will agree that the very direction of NATO strategists' thoughts cannot fail to elicit profound alarm.

All the more so since the NATO Council session involving President Clinton has already adopted a decree couched in the same adventurist vein: This is the first time that all the military bloc's 16 countries have backed a long-standing U.S. threat capable of causing an explosion of tremendous destructive force in the

"Balkan powder keg." The NATO countries agreed to the possibility of carrying out air strikes on Bosnian Serb positions.

This decision also constitutes a direct challenge to Russia. After all, even Kozyrev's Foreign Ministry has recently begun to talk (finally!) of a traditional Russian-Serb partnership. You would have thought that the response to the NATO provocation should have been immediate condemnation of this adventurism. But no! Russia seems to have once again perceived a diplomatic slap in the face as something fitting, once again sacrificed the interests of its friends and, moreover, its own.

Before Clinton's meeting with Yeltsin, rumors came from the Russian Foreign Ministry that were picked up by some publications: If the U.S. President takes it into his head to encroach on Russia's vital interests and, in particular, "tries to introduce the concept of internationalizing the conflicts on the territory of the former USSR, the Russian side intends to put up stiff opposition to these attempts."

However, the rumors of a "stiff" Russian stance were simply bluff. In effect, it was once again a one-sided affair and Clinton understandably secured the diplomatic success planned in Washington.

The U.S. President was particularly proud of the fact that he succeeded in persuading Ukrainian President Kravchuk to sign a tripartite statement and memorandum, in which Ukraine pledged to eliminate the nuclear arsenal left on its territory following the breakup of the Soviet Union: It is a question of 176 ICBM's and 15,000 nuclear warheads. Clinton described this as an historic agreement although he acknowledged that it will give rise to frenzied debate in the Ukrainian parliament.

Be that as it may, the first aim of Clinton's European marathon seems to have been achieved—at any rate, to some extent. Things are far trickier as regards support for B.N. Yeltsin. After all, the latest geopolitical concessions have occurred against a new backdrop. Britain's THE GUARDIAN points out that "pro-U.S. rhetoric has gone out of style in the Russian capital." And as for Clinton's latest promises "of support for Russian reforms," they are already generating ridicule, the newspaper remarked sarcastically.

...During the solemn ceremony in St. George's Hall in the Grand Kremlin Palace Bill Clinton delivered a welcome speech, which might be an illustration for Paragraph 545 of the primer by John Wood and Dzhan Serre [name as transliterated], "Diplomatic Ceremonial and Protocol," since it had all the components befitting the occasion: a greeting to his host, the general ideas behind the meeting, and, last, a desire for the prosperity and happiness of the country and people. There was, however, one blunder in the impromptu speech: The U.S. President uttered the words "Soviet nation." But a quick-witted interpreter omitted the careless phrase.

The host of the reception also observed diplomatic protocol and, in the best U.S. traditions, "kept on smiling" as if saying the English word "cheese" in front of the television camera. Cheese is best supposed to "suppress the appetite" at receptions! It was announced that Clinton has promised Russia $900 million next year for aid with pro-Western reforms. This is probably the "piece of fresh free cheese in the mouse trap" that Aleksandr Rutskoy mentioned humorously before the summit in Vancouver when describing Western "aid"....

Paper Cites U.S., UK, French Media on Clinton Visit

PM1401141794 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 3

[ITAR-TASS report: "Success of Reforms in Russia Will Benefit Everyone"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Jan—"U.S. President Bill Clinton has arrived in Moscow for his meeting with President Boris Yeltsin, the stakes of which are high," CBS noted. "The president had earlier been on a three-day trip around Europe, where he had to contend with the difficult problems of security in the world which have arisen since the end of the Cold War."

Clinton stopped off in Ukraine en route to Moscow and concluded a deal there whereby all the former Soviet nuclear missiles on Ukrainian territory will be handed over to Russia, the report commented. "There has actually been no use whatsoever for these weapons. They have been targeted on the United States, with which Ukraine most of all wants to enjoy friendly relations."

London, 13 Jan—THE DAILY TELEGRAPH writes: The American president's television address to the people of Russia could be the most important feature of the American president's visit to Moscow. If Clinton strikes the right note, appeals to the Russians' pride and patriotism, and refrains from delivering a lecture on the theme of the free market and democracy he will improve relations between the two countries. But if he is unable to do this, it will only intensify skepticism regarding the "American Dream," which is something now manifest not just among extremists.

Paris, 13 Jan—The success of the political and economic reforms in Russia will lead to the reform of the Russian state's foreign policy, LE MONDE thinks, noting that this explains Clinton's desire to support Yeltsin. The American president is convinced that a democratic Russia will not threaten its neighbors or show hegemonic tendencies in Europe, but not all members of his administration share such a viewpoint. In assessing the Russian-American summit talks now under way the newspaper opines that the United States will pressure the IMF to be more energetic in granting financial aid.

Clinton Visit Leaves 'Question Mark' Over Reform

PM1801101794 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 94 p 7

[Yelena Ovcharenko and Leonid Timofeyev article under the general heading: "A Loaf of Bread—Half Each. Is U.S. President Bill Clinton Prepared To Share It with the Russian People?"]

[Text] Moscow—If we take a look at the outward aspect of the visit, it was arranged in the best traditions of "warm hat and suit" diplomacy. The "walkabout" included some curious details: The U.S. President looked in at a store which sells, in addition to fish and meat, the widely advertised U.S. slimming products called Ultra Slim Fast, which fact usually perplexes quick-witted foreigners—if the Russians do not have enough money for food, are they really prepared to shell it out on dietetic substitutes? In the bakery, which the inquisitive guest from across the ocean also visited, a mass of people were standing in line for bread. Clinton pulled rubles from his pocket and asked for a long white loaf. But his political flexibility is evidently complemented by an equally quick personal reaction, for he unhesitatingly took the saleswoman's advice: "Take the black bread, it is fresher."

Moscow was the only stop on Bill Clinton's current tour where he dispensed with impromptu gastronomic shows. In Brussels there was a visit to a cafe, and in Prague a portion of schnitzel with a glass of beer in a small restaurant, while in our country he had to make do with supper at "Ogarevo," where the Yeltsins served caviar, pickled mushrooms, elk meat, and suckling pig around the family table.

As for political delicacies, these too were provided for in the program of the visit. Reformers of various kinds were invited to meet with the President for the first time. Let us leave without comment the statement by Mr. Zhirinovskiy, who was not invited to Spaso House: "He is a coward. He is afraid of me." On the other hand, the appearance of 25-year-old banker Maksim Travkin, who was taken to be the representative of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia, at the lofty gathering did not go unnoticed. Nor was it a coincidence that Anthony Lake, adviser to the U.S. President for national security affairs, spent a whole half-hour talking with Gennadiy Zyuganov, leader of the Russian Communists.

Finally, even after the visit to Moscow, Boris Yeltsin's policy of reforms, which the U.S. President supported publicly and fervently, should be expected to have a big question mark over it with many people in America—congressmen, scientists, and experts. At the final news conference one of the U.S. journalists asked Boris Yeltsin: Maybe the "shock" therapy ought to be eased somewhat, mindful of the high price the people of Russia are paying for this? "No," the president replied curtly. There will be no indulgence. He implied that even the loss of public support in the last elections will not turn the Kremlin away from tough measures. This statement by the Russian president was at once publicly applauded by the U.S. consultant and adviser Jeffrey Sachs, who believes that it certainly is not the "shock therapy," but panic that is to blame for the calamitous situation in the Russian economy. When the panic ends, economic stabilization will supposedly begin. But Professor S. Cohen, the well-known political scientist, thinks differently. "I do not know how to describe what B. Yeltsin's government has been doing in the economic sphere since 1992—'shock therapy' or something foolish," Cohen said on strolling around Tishinskiy Market with a CBS-TV presenter. "For the people we see hear this policy has meant the loss of all their life savings and a disastrous drop in living standards. I am afraid that President Clinton has not discerned the real Russia in the time he has spent in Moscow. The real Russia today is more like this flea market." Let us stay silent on the flea market, but it is correct that our political leapfrogging is a kind of "shock therapy" for Washington.

TU Leader Satisfied With 14 Jan Talks With Clinton

LD1401185494 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] The Chairman of Russia's Independent Union of Miners, Aleksandr Sergeyev, told Interfax on Friday that "he is satisfied with the discussion that a group of union leaders conducted with President Bill Clinton at a formal reception in the U.S. ambassador's residence in Moscow on Thursday."

In his words, at a brief meeting the sides touched upon the problems of the workers' movement in Russia at a time of economic reform, international cooperation between free unions, and prospects of its development.

At the end of the meeting, according to Sergeyev, Clinton instructed one of his aides to prepare a detailed report on the world trade union movement.

Rights Campaigners Seek To Tell Clinton of Abuses

PM1401151594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jan 94 First Edition p 2

[Marina Lebedeva report: "Human Rights Campaigners Concerned at Violations in Russia and Intend To Speak to Clinton About It"]

[Text] A news conference has been held at the "Memorial" human rights society.

In the opinion of the conference's organizers—the Russian-U.S. Human Rights Bureau, the "Memorial" human rights center, "Helsinki Watch," the "Civil Aid" committee, and other organizations—over the past six months and particularly in connection with the October events the situation with regard to human rights compliance in Russia has deteriorated sharply.

"We intend to express our concern at the present situation," the director of the Moscow branch of the Russian-U.S. Human Rights Bureau said, "and to bring to B. Clinton's notice specific instances of human rights violations."

S. Ganushkina, cochairman of the "Civil Aid" committee, pointed out that, although Russia subscribed to the Geneva Convention on Refugees and adopted the Russian law on refugees in its spirit, it is fulfilling neither document. Refugees are virtually denied this status. In particular, refugees from the Caucasus and Central Asia end up in a grave situation. Ganushkina pointed out that they are being combated with all kinds of decrees, both covert and overt. The latest decision is to expel from hotels and hostels refugees who have already lived in Moscow for four years. As of 1 January this year they are obliged to pay the full cost of the room, which is totally impossible for the absolute majority—sick people and pensioners.

V. Abramkin, director of the Center To Promote Prison Reform in Russia, said:

"There are now approximately 1 million prisoners in Russia. According to physicians' estimates, 100,000 prisoners are ill with tuberculosis, 20,000 of them in an acute form. There is insufficient meat, bread, and milk in the prisons and detention centers where they are held. There are many complaints about prisoners being beaten up and tortured. Prisons and detention centers in large cities are overflowing."

Kravchuk Holds News Conference in Moscow 14 Jan

Denies Compensation Rumor

LD1401133694

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1200 GMT on 14 January broadcasts a report by Anton Grishin on the news conference given by Ukraine President Leonid Kravchuk at Ukraine's Embassy in Moscow today, which contains recorded remarks by Kravchuk.

Kravchuk says: "I would like to express my satisfaction that people have shown understanding of Ukraine's situation and have not simply tried to force it to agree—I really did not want to use this expression, but it is being used in some political circles—I mean the idea of exerting pressure, of forcing Ukraine to agree. We insisted all the way through that people should understand our situation, our position, and we achieved this without damaging other states' interests; on the contrary, in a way beneficial to other states."

Grishin summarizes the agreements signed today, and adds:

"Leonid Kravchuk denied outright information that Ukraine is to receive $1 billion in compensation for the uranium deal. As for the problem of the Black Sea Fleet, the leader of Ukraine said that Moscow and Kiev can settle the issue in a way that takes account of both sides' interests, and that Ukraine is ready for dialogue."

Greets Deal as 'Historic'

LD1401143294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1412 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Vladimir Taranov]

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk expressed satisfaction with his meeting with Russian and U.S. Presidents Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton here on Friday [14 January].

"This is a historic moment," he said at a news conference at the Ukrainian Embassy in Moscow, noting that "Ukraine, along with other states, is marching along the road of nuclear disarmament."

In Kravchuk's opinion, the joint Russian-American-Ukrainian agreement, signed in Moscow, on the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine gives it a guarantee of security and will help to receive compensation in nuclear fuel.

The agreement will also help to step up economic relations with other countries. The withdrawal of strategic nuclear weapons from Ukraine is based on the Russian-Ukrainian treaty.

As for tactical nuclear weapons withdrawn from the republic, Russian, U.S. and Ukrainian experts will have to determine their value, the Ukrainian president stressed.

Later, Ukraine will be compensated in the form of subtraction from Ukrainian debts to Russia for energy carriers.

Noting that Russian-Ukrainian relations were given a new impetus, Kravchuk expressed confidence that the problem of the Black Sea Fleet will be settled in 1994 and "then our countries will have a good prospect for the future".

"In geopolitical respect, we have to live on this earth of ours, and there is no other way out," the Ukrainian president stressed.

Hails Tripartite Nuclear Arms Agreement

LD1401212994 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1740 GMT 14 Jan 94

[From the "Presidential Bulletin" feature]

[Text] President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine says the three- nation agreement that Russia, the U.S., and Ukraine signed in Moscow on Friday [14 January] to withdraw the nuclear weapons his country inherited

from the former Soviet Union is an indication of understanding of Kiev's problems rather than the result of pressure or arm twisting.

Speaking at the Ukrainian embassy in Moscow on Friday, he said the new agreement would be make it possible to send the Start-I treaty for parliamentary ratification because the conditions set in a resolution by the Supreme Soviet have now been removed.

Kravchuk says his country is given assurances of security guarantees, territorial integrity, financial incentives for the weapons and help in dismantling them, and no threat of economic pressure.

For its part, Moscow is committed to supply fuel grade uranium to Ukraine, minus the cost of dismantling the weapons and reprocessing the nuclear warheads, Kravchuk told Interfax.

He said that experts on all sides are yet to estimate the amount and form of compensation for the tactical nuclear weapons to be withdrawn from Ukraine. One option is to write off the Ukrainian debt for fuel imports from Russia, Kravchuk said.

IF [INTERFAX] Note: Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told Interfax Friday that as a result of the dismantling of Ukrainian missiles Kiev would receive nuclear fuel in the form of rods for uranium reactors, but "there is no question about writing off the Ukrainian debt to Russia."

In response to Kozyrev's statement his Ukrainian counterpart Anatoliy Zlenko underlined in his conversation with Interfax that this form of compensation is foreseen in the tripartite Russian- American-Ukrainian agreement on the withdrawal of nuclear missiles from the Ukraine's territory signed in Moscow.

The Ukrainian leader denied allegations that his country was offered $1 billion as compensation for the withdrawal of its nuclear weapons. He said the question was not on the agenda.

As a next step, said Kravchuk, Moscow and Kiev could try to resolve the dispute over the Black Sea Fleet this year, proceeding from the interests of Russia, Ukraine, and Crimea. If the two problems are removed, he said, this will help to put bilateral relations on a friendlier footing as befits partners and good neighbors.

Warns of Danger of Zhirinovskiy

LD1401213294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1702 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk has drawn attention to the danger presented by the political movement headed by the leader of the Liberal Democrats Vladimir Zhirinovskiy.

At a news conference in Ukrainian Embassy in Moscow Friday [14 January], Kravchuk recognized that the deputy to the State Duma Vladimir Zhirinovskiy had been legitimately elected by Russian people, but he called him a dangerous phenomenon from the point of view of the concept he declares.

The Ukrainian President said that the difference should be seen between the declarations of ideas and their implementation. He called on the Russian and Ukrainian Democrats to unite to nip in the bud the political movement led by Zhirinovskiy, even though the movement is already represented in parliament.

This movement is dangerous for everybody, not solely for Ukraine, said Kravchuk. There is no need to think that only Ukraine will be the victim of nationalism if it wins in Russia, he said.

Official Reaction to Tripartite Agreement Noted

Kozyrev on Security Guarantees

LD1401180794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1630 GMT 14 Jan 94

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] A write-off of Kiev's debt for fuel imports from Russia for the dismantling of nuclear warheads it inherited from the former Soviet Union cannot be recognized as a form of compensation, Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told Interfax.

He was commenting on the outcome of the three-nation summit ending in Moscow on Friday [14 January].

"After all, all those missiles are part of the former Soviet Union's property and each republic, including Ukraine, can claim for part of it. We will handle it in a way wanted by the Ukrainians," the minister said. "As far as I know, they prefer to obtain fuel grade uranium reprocessed from the nuclear warheads, he said adding "we respect their right".

On the other hand, said the minister, "the Belarussians want to receive their share of the weapons in money, and why not?"

The minister ruled out any extra payment to Kiev, saying it would be humiliating to Ukraine itself and a very strange thing for Russia to do.

Kozyrev said the United States had agreed to allocate some $60-70 Mn to pay for the cost of transporting the weapons from Ukraine to Russia. He described the spending involved as high but inevitable, given that the operation must be carried out in a way that would preclude any new Chernobyl-style accidents.

Incidentally, said the minister, the operation was caused by a technological necessity rather than by a desire to snub Ukraine. The missiles must be dismantled where they were assembled and Russia alone had such facilities, Kozyrev said.

More importantly, he went on to say, the leaders of the three countries meeting in Moscow on Friday reaffirmed their political will to get the problem resolved. The minister believes technical problems to be secondary.

The assurances of security guarantees given to Ukraine by Russia and the United States were similar to those which the co- founders of the non-proliferation treaty - the U.S., Britain and Russia - offered to all signatories under a Security Council resolution, Kozyrev said. These automatically covered any country, including Ukraine, if it gives up its nuclear status, he said. However, the minister said that security guarantees would be effective only after Kiev joined the non-proliferation treaty as a denuclearized nation. But he does not rule out the possibility of some sort of "Ukrainian specifics."

On the Russian-American summit itself, Kozyrev said human rights had also been high on the agenda. The two sides were somewhat at odds on the issue of Russian pullout from the Baltic states and the plight of ethnic Russians there, he said.

Unlike the Americans and other western countries which start with troop withdrawals, said the minister, we think it more correct to begin in reverse order. "We are ready to pull out troops," he said, "but will the Balts be prepared to observe human rights in full measure?" While sharing President Yeltsin's position on the issue, I think Mr. Clinton's statement of commitment to the human rights situation in the Baltic states is one of the achievements of the Moscow summit, the Russian minister said.

Kozyrev on Compensation

LD1401223494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2144 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—The documents on the complete destruction of Ukraine's nuclear arsenal by its transfer to and scrapping in Russia, which were signed in the Kremlin, also determine the procedure of the payment of compensation to Kiev for their loss, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev said in an interview with ITAR-TASS.

This loss, according to Kozyrev, will be made up with uranium fuel, which Russia will obtain after recycling the weapon-grade uranium in collaboration with the United States. Part of the profit gained from the sale of uranium on the world market belongs to Ukraine, Kozyrev noted. The uranium after all is the property of the former Soviet Union, which is why the profit from its sale will be divided, he said. "We ourselves will obtain weapon-grade uranium, recycle it and sell to America, and the share belonging to Ukraine will be paid in the form of uranium fuel," he clarified.

According to the Russian foreign minister, there is no provision for any additional payments by Russia, and also of writing off a part of Ukraine's debts.

Andrey Kozyrev said that the United States will provide additional resources so that Moscow and Kiev can both ensure safety during the dismantling of the nuclear arsenal, its transportation and other necessary procedures. Naturally, the dismantling of the arsenal - the nuclear contents and the warhead - will be carried out in Russia only. Not because, Kozyrev emphasised, Moscow wants to humiliate or offend Ukraine, but because the appropriate plants are located in Russia and a warhead can only be dismantled where it was made, otherwise there would be a real danger of monstrous environmental consequences.

The signed agreements really are historical. A political decision has been made and the political will has been displayed, now only "purely technical work" is needed to go ahead, Kozyrev said. First of all we should determine the share belonging to Ukraine, deduct from it Russia's expenses on recycling it and other works and repay this part "in whatever form the Ukrainians want and the Russians can manage," he said. But it is a purely technical question, the Russian minister said.

Speaking of security guarantees given to Ukraine, Andrey Kozyrev emphasised that they are basically standard ones. These are the same guarantees which the three countries, the United States, England and Russia, give to all the participants in the non- proliferation of nuclear weapons treaty. It is quite natural that the signed documents will come into force only after Ukraine joins the nuclear weapon non-proliferation treaty as a non-nuclear state, the Russian minister said.

Mamedov Says Russia Should Favor Ukraine

LD1501180994 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1626 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] Russia's deputy Foreign Minister Georgy Mamedov, in charge of relations with the United States, believes that Russia should give priority to relations with Ukraine but not with the United States. In his interview with Interfax Mamedov expressed opinion that the tripartite Russian-American-Ukrainian agreement on nuclear weapons withdrawal from the Ukrainian territory is one of the major results of the U.S. President Bill Clinton's visit to Moscow. "We have all grounds to be satisfied," he said.

Mamedov specially stressed that Russian President Boris Yeltsin was initiator of the proposal to hold a tripartite meeting in Moscow.

According to Mamedov, "the uranium contract" which has also become one of the major results of the Moscow summit would not have been signed if we had failed to agree with Kiev.

When asked about the scale of compensation which Russia would pay to Ukraine for the nuclear weapons to

be withdrawn from its territory, Mamedov answered that "on the whole this problem has been coordinated." "The agreement signed in Massandra (Crimea) fixes the volume of the compensation, cost, sums, etc. The Americans have repeatedly declared about their support to the Massandra agreements. One can view the Moscow agreement as their further development," he said.

As Mamedov said, a compromise formula was agreed "primarily not at the tripartite Russian-American-Ukrainian talks in Washington but between the Ukrainian leadership and us."

"The thing is that we are withdrawing nuclear weapons from Ukraine to Russia, dismantling it, extracting uranium, and selling fuel uranium to America. A part of these funds with the exception of expenditures attributed to transportation, storage, and re- processing of uranium Russia will hand over to Ukraine as compensation," he continued.

Mamedov does not rule out possibility that at first Russia would give uranium to Ukraine as fuel for its atomic power stations. "We shall probably retain part of this fuel for ourselves. Nobody is going to rob us," he noted.

Mamedov also reported that the Moscow summit had discussed "very interesting proposals regarding the fact how one can re- focus international package of assistance to Russia given our difficult economic situation." "The Americans understand quite well that Russians should feel that democracy gives something to them that it is not just a trap into which they have been pushed," her said.

As an example Interfax interlocutor mentioned the following: "Russia delivers oil to its neighbors, former Soviet republics. We increase the prices to the world ones. But it can occur that our partners will not be able to procure oil in our country. Then we shall be deprived of markets. They can be occupied by rich oil producing countries which can offer more beneficial conditions. What has America done? - The Americans have persuaded the "G-7" and International Monetary Fund to grant subsidies to our neighbors so that they would continue to buy Russian oil. It's an absolutely new form of partnership."

Russian, Ukrainian Officials Comment

LD1401220594

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1725 GMT on 14 January carries the regularly scheduled "Details" program. The program, hosted by Nikolay Svanidze, contains excerpts of interviews with Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, and Ukrainian Ambassador to Russia Vladimir Kryzhanovskiy, by unidentified correspondents. Places and dates of the interviews are not given.

The program opens with an excerpt from Kravchuk who says that 14 January is New Year's Day according to the "old calendar." Therefore, he wishes the people of Russia and everybody a Happy New Year. Kravchuk says, "And on the whole, this month is, let us say, a new beginning because today is the beginning of a new account because today's document is the beginning of a new page for Ukraine, for Russia, and for the whole world."

Svanidze then says that in Moscow today the presidents of Russia, the United States, and Ukraine discussed nuclear weapons, and Ukraine agreed to withdraw to Russia 176 intercontinental missiles and approximately 1,500 warheads for dismantling.

Next follows an excerpt of Vladimir Kryzhanovskiy's interview. He says: "Ukraine is not backing down. I would call it a trilateral compromise. All three sides made some compromises. I would not say that the biggest compromise was made by Ukraine."

In a further excerpt of the Kravchuk interview, Kravchuk says: "To embark upon the path of confrontation or ambition is a bad thing. Most in Ukraine understand this, I know. Unfortunately, there are people who see things differently. Fortunately, such people are in the minority."

Then Kryzhanovskiy says in his interview, "The president, in this case, is carrying out, in full and in principle, the will of the people. Moreover, there are even certain, I would say, contradictions between him and the parliament, which wants these weapons to remain on the territory of Ukraine for a certain time, until certain conditions prevail."

Svanidze says that Kravchuk is in a difficult situation. He has been performing a balancing act for the past two years—balancing the temptation to be leader of a nuclear state and the impossibility of keeping these "expensive toys."

Kryzhanovskiy is then shown saying, "We are not thinking of servicing of these nuclear weapons. We were counting on them being serviced by Russian specialists alone."

Next is an excerpt from Kravchuk, who says, "The nuclear weapons which we inherited from the former Soviet Union could not be used by Ukraine, speaking frankly, as a guarantor of security or as weapons of deterrence, because they were manufactured in Russia: the codes in Russia, the buttons in Russia. Therefore, that is all an illusion."

An excerpt from the Kozyrev interview follows. He says, "Against whom were the nuclear missiles in Ukraine, which were installed by the former Soviet Union, directed? Against the United States and NATO, and they are aimed at the United States. They are not aimed at Russia. And the missiles which are in America? They used to be aimed at the Soviet Union—and now in Moscow... [pauses] and incidentally, that bilateral, Russian-American agreement is much more important for

us. Why? Because American weapons used to and are still to this day aimed at Moscow. Nuclear weapons, each of which is capable of wiping out in a second what we have here.

"Well, the agreement reached on not targeting them, the flight assignment is to be canceled, and that process will be finished in about two months. That is what the Presidents of Russia and the United States agreed in Moscow. That is to say, you and I are no longer rabbits. At least, in two months we will not be in a situation where any madman may at any moment press that infamous button by accident and a missile will fly according to an assignment set years ago - namely towards us. It will fly, but most likely, into space. Do you understand [word indistinct]? That is a substantial thing. The Ukrainian missiles—that is those in Ukraine—are not aimed at us. Therefore, it may be important for the Americans for the missiles are aimed at them."

Svanidze, shown sitting on a sofa beside Kozyrev, asks if the missiles can be pointed at a new target. Kozyrev replies: "But it is not that easy to retarget them, and Moscow is the one who has to retarget them because that infamous button for these missiles is in Moscow. Naturally, we will not do that. We will not point these missiles at ourselves."

Svanidze says that pressure has been brought to bear on Kravchuk from domestic and foreign forces. He was beset by crisis in 1993 and anti-Russian feeling is running high in Ukraine, but compensation is promised Ukraine for giving up its nuclear weapons.

Kravchuk is shown saying, "Taking account of the fact that there will be compensation for the tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, that there will guarantees of national security, financial, economic, technical and guaranteed aid. All of that is in Ukraine's interest."

Svanidze then says that Ukraine has not managed to step out of Russia's shadow and embark upon independent dialogue with the West, but Kravchuk did what he had to do as president of a country beset by economic problems such as Ukraine's.

Kravchuk is again shown. He says, "It is not that one will be the older and the other the younger, that one is the older brother and one the younger brother, that one is the leader and the other is subordinate. The peoples will be equal. Equal in all their relations, one a bit more, one a bit less."

A further fragment of Kozyrev's interview follows: "The episode with Ukraine is the clearing away of Russia's old obstructions. Do you see? Essentially, the meeting on the Ukrainian theme, unfortunately, took place two years later than it should have, and this is the reason for the delay in the process of the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine."

Defense Officials Meet

LD1401222094 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1702 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] On Friday in Moscow, Russia's First Deputy Defense Minister Andrey Kokoshin and Chief of Russia's General Staff Colonel General Mikhail Kolesnikov met with the Ukrainian Defense Minister Vitaliy Radetskyy.

The Russian Defense Ministry's Information and Press Department told INTERFAX that in the course of the conversation the parties discussed ways to effectively implement agreements reached between leaders of the two countries' Defense Departments in Moscow and aimed at further development of military cooperation between Russia and Ukraine and tripartite agreements between Russia, United States, and Ukraine on liquidation of nuclear weapons on Ukraine's territory.

The discussion was being held in a constructive mood.

Political Situation in Kiev Noted

PM1401203194 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 First Edition pp 1-2

[Vasiliy Kononenko and Aleksandr Sychev report: "Three Presidents Close Last Chapter of 'Cold War' in Kremlin"]

[Text] U.S. President Bill Clinton's visit to Moscow is nearing its end, and the results of the meetings, during which the head of the Washington administration expressed support for the reforms being carried out in Russia, can be summed up.

The presidents of the United States, Russia, and Ukraine signed a treaty finally defining the fate of the 176 ICBM's and their 1,600 nuclear warheads on Ukrainian territory. "The three of us," President Yeltsin said, "met to close the last chapter [postavit tochku] on the last problem of the 'Cold War.'"

Kiev gets a full security guarantee and pledges to dispatch its entire arsenal to Russia for dismantling and for the removal from the warheads and storage of the highly enriched fissionable material. After being processed the uranium from the warheads will be sold in the United States for use in nuclear power stations, and the money raised—$1 billion—will be given by Washington to Kiev, and will also be returned to Ukrainian nuclear power stations. At the same time, agreement was reached on the purchase by America of uranium worth $12 billion removed from the Russian nuclear weapons to be destroyed under the START II Treaty. The contract covers a 20-year period.

The treaty on the nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory—the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world—is undoubtedly Clinton's most important achievement. But the signing of the document was overshadowed by reports of the reaction of deputies in the Ukrainian

parliament. Sergey Golovatyy, a member of the Supreme Council's Foreign Policy Committee in Kiev, said: "Kravchuk can sign anything he likes. But if parliament does not ratify the treaty, it will remain a piece of paper."

The Ukrainian president has waiting for him back at home a seriously deteriorating political situation whose outcome hardly anyone will venture to predict. The problem of nuclear weapons in Ukraine has by no means been settled with the signing of the agreement.

Another agreement signed during the visit was the document on the retargeting of Russian and U.S. strategic missiles. Some of them will be targeted to empty areas of the high seas, while no flight plans at all will be entered into the computers of the others. It is virtually impossible to verify compliance with this agreement. But, despite its symbolic nature, Thomas Pickering, the U.S. ambassador to Russia, said that "it is of enormous importance for the strengthening of confidence between the two countries."

It is said in the U.S. President's entourage that Clinton was greatly impressed with "Russia's progress along the road to a free market." Presumably a definite role in this was played by Moscow's numerous booths, stalls, and private stores, as well as by his meetings with Muscovites, which illustrated what Clinton learned from his talks in the Kremlin and during dinner at President Yeltsin's residence near Moscow. Addressing Muscovites directly, Clinton said: Everyone earning their daily bread in dogged work "should know that ultimately they will be rewarded." He also reported that the talks touched on issues whose resolution should "make their lives better."

Clinton did not propose a new package of aid for Russia—nor had Moscow expected him to, incidentally. The Russian leadership had set itself two tasks—to get Washington to lift the restrictions on Russian exports to the United States (it remains to be seen how far this problem was solved) and to get the money it had already been promised.

Russia received the first $1.5 billion from the IMF last June. A second package of another $1.5 billion should have followed soon after. But it was not transferred to Moscow, which was unable to reduce the inflation rate and the budget deficit to the agreed level.

Moreover, it has been learned that the World Bank is prepared to grant Russia $500 million out of previously allocated funds in order to improve the position of Russian citizens. Michael Blumenthal, treasury secretary in the Carter administration, will head a ($100-million) program to help privatize major Russian companies. Despite the United States' economic difficulties, President Clinton hopes, according to his entourage, to find another $1 billion for Russia this year.

Main attention during the talks was devoted to measures to accelerate the reform program and define its goals. The sides agreed that it is necessary to make a greater effort to control inflation and support the least protected sections of the population by saving funds on programs to finance inefficient state enterprises. Clinton called for additional measures to be taken to encourage Western private investors to invest more in the Russian economy. In the meantime, U.S. entrepreneurs are known to be among the most cautious. Their investment is estimated at just $700 million.

'Secret Diplomacy' Helped

PM1401204594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 First Edition p 4

[Aleksandr Shalnev report: "Elimination of Ukrainian Nuclear Arsenal Is Success For Secret Diplomacy"]

[Text] "In the event, God forbid, of a conflict between Russia and Ukraine over the Crimea, who would the United States—which has just proposed that Kiev join NATO within the framework of the 'Partnership for Peace' program—side with?"

A well-known American reporter revealed that this was a question he wanted to put to U.S. President Bill Clinton if the opportunity arose. It is a good question and one directly linked with the truly sensational agreement which, contrary to expectations, Moscow, Kiev, and Washington have managed to acheive, proposing to turn Ukraine into a nuclear-free zone.

The reporter did not particularly philosophize about his question. The terms of the agreement—even now that its text has been published—clearly leave a lot unrevealed: Some aspects will need detailed explanation, and it is not ruled out that modifications will be required "in the course of business" [v rabochem poryadke].

It is becoming clear from the discussions with the Americans who accompanied the President that Washington was just as hasty a partner in this deal as Kiev—although for entirely different reasons. It was Washington, insofar as we understand it, which insisted that the Russian and Ukrainian delegations conducting the talks in the U.S. capital postpone their return home 5 January in order to use the time to intensify the search for a solution to outstanding problems. The delegations tarried, but when Clinton left Washington for Europe on Saturday 8 January he still had no confidence that the deal would go ahead, although he had been told that there had been "a certain amount of progress."

The deal was struck on Monday, 10 January—that was when the U.S. ambassador in Moscow and the leader of the U.S. ambassadorial mission in Kiev informed the State Department and the Clinton team touring Europe that Presidents Yeltsin and Kravchuk had initialed the agreement reached by their delegations.

Why was Clinton in a hurry? Among the explanations we have heard the most rational is the simplest—over the past few months the problem of preventing nuclear arms

proliferation has been top of his personal agenda and personal list of priorities. The U.S. President saw Ukrainian nuclear disarmament as his most realistic chance to take the first and most most substantive step in this direction. If such an agreement were reached it would, moreover, be another foreign policy triumph for Clinton—the second following the reconciliation between Israel and the PLO. Such a triumph would not be out of place for the President at a time when he faces growing scandals at home—scandals which many are already comparing to Nixon's Watergate.

Achieving this goal on his personal agenda was made considerably easier for Clinton by the fact that, Ukraine, as one of my interlocutors put it, was by then "pretty much ready—it had virtually doomed itself to isolation in the international arena, as demonstrated by Clinton's refusal, widely trumped by the Washington White House, to visit Ukraine during his tour of the former Union, and to restrict himself to Moscow and—a particular blow to the Ukrainians—to Minsk." Kiev clearly understood that going further down the road which Ukraine had followed since essentially refusing to ratify START I would mean depriving the country of Western aid. The agreement to get things moving opened up some nice prospects for Kiev—in the form of an extension of aid not so much through bilateral channels as through the channels of international organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Moreover, Washington could not fail to notice the personal ambitions of Kravchuk, who has an undoubted interest in gaining genuine recognition from the international community and achieving the standing of a statesmen with whom you can "do business."

One other point—the Ukrainian lobby, which is very strong in those states of America which play a key role in the presidential election, was exerting very great pressure on the Washington White House to ensure that Ukraine was properly treated and certainly not dealt with on a lower footing than America's relationship with Belarus.

That was the backdrop against which the search for a compromise was accelerated. Very substantial people were involved on the American side—the man in charge was Strobe Talbott, number two at the State Department; the team also included Lynn Davis, another under secretary of state, and Nick Burns, a leading specialist on the former Union at the National Security Council. Tactically, the U.S. delegation's job, which met with understanding from the Russian delegation, was based on creating additional incentives for Ukraine in the shape of firm guarantees of economic and financial aid and help in contacts with international departments where the United States traditionally wields great influence. A key factor was, as sources put it, Washington's readiness to respond appropriately to Kiev's longstanding concern that, in giving up its nuclear weapons, it would be exposed to the threat of a strike, say, from the East, from Russia. Formerly Washington had avoided any pledges on this score, apart from quite simply referring to the fact that Ukraine's accession to the nonproliferation regime would automatically give it the guarantees it wanted. Kiev was not satisfied with this and insisted on more. The proposal to join NATO's "Partnership for Peace" program will, as Washington explained to Kiev, satisfy its longstanding wishes and demands.

Admittedly, there immediately arises the question about a hypothetical war over the Crimea which the American reporter would have liked to have asked the American President.

But, alas, there are plenty of other questions too.

Weapons-Grade Uranium Contract With United States Viewed

MK1501110094 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Andrey Vaganov report under the "Cooperation" rubric: "Russia Will Sell Weapons-Grade Uranium in the United States. Contract Signed to This Effect. Everyone Should be Pleased, Including Ukraine"]

[Text] An executive contract between Russia and the United States on deliveries of Russian weapons-grade uranium to the United States was signed at 1000 yesterday in the secluded atmosphere of Collegium Hall of the former Ministry of Medium Machine-Building (now the Ministry of Atomic Energy). Making a short speech before the signing of the document, Viktor Mikhaylov, Russian Federation minister of atomic energy, pointed out that the ceremony was taking place in a historic room: All decisions on the creation of nuclear weapons in Russia had been made right there, and foreign visitors were present there for the first time.

One should think that in citing this fact the minister wished once again to emphasize the historic importance of the event. Indeed, this contract (from the Russian side it was signed by Albert Shishkin, president of the "Tekhnosnabeksport" foreign trade company of the Russian Federation Ministry of Atomic Energy, and on the American side by the director of the U.S. Enrichment Corporation—USEC—William Timbers) signals the start of real disarmament. In line with its provisions, 500 tonnes of weapons-grade uranium are supposed to be sold to the United States over 20 years (Russia's aggregate stocks of weapons-grade uranium are 1,250 tonnes). Thus, more than 20,000 nuclear warheads will be destroyed. During the first five years, 10 tonnes will be sold each year, and 30 tonnes a year will be sold during the following years. This schedule is explained by the fact that neither Russia nor the United States has the production facilities at the moment for the depletion of enriched uranium (from 90 to 5 percent). Nonetheless the level of such technology in Russia proves to be higher than in the United States.

To implement the contract, the world's largest joint Russian- American uranium company is being created. It should be stressed in this connection that the United States controls 50 percent of the world uranium market today; Russia controls 5 to 6 percent of the market while having the same uranium production facilities. The contract that was signed means in fact that the United States is letting Russia use one of the segments of its market.

Answering a question from your NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent on how it had become possible to resolve within the framework of the contract the question that proved to be a stumbling block while the document was in preparation (the U.S. Government insisted on sharing profits from the sales of uranium between Russia and Ukraine), Mikhaylov said that there too it became possible to find a mutually acceptable option. Profit from the sales of weapons-grade uranium from strategic nuclear warheads, if any, will be partially returned to Ukraine in the shape of fuel compacts for its nuclear electric power stations. As for battlefield nuclear weapons, according to the minister, experts of Russia and Ukraine are yet to determine whether any profit is possible there at all. Russia is already spending millions of dollars on the dismantling and transportation alone of battlefield nuclear weapons from Ukraine. (Incidentally, the dismantling and storing of one nuclear warhead in the United States costs between $30 and $100,000; in Russia the cost is a tenth of the amount because our personnel are paid less).

Viktor Mikhaylov also stressed that, in his opinion, Ukraine should be pleased with the signed Russian-American document: "Unless this problem is solved today, Ukraine itself in a couple of years would have to pay someone who would undertake to dismantle its nuclear missiles.

Neither will the United States come out a loser: during the first year alone of the implementation of the contract, weapons- grade uranium from Russia will provide fuel for 15 American nuclear reactors. Energy generated by them would provide electricity for 10 million homes.

At the same time, despite the substantial sum of the contract—nearly $12 billion—the Russian Federation Ministry of Atomic Energy will only be able to pay part of its nuclear warhead recycling costs out of it.

Weapons-Grade Plutonium Stored

AU1401194894 Hamburg DIE WOCHE in German 13 Jan 94 p 23

[Interview with the head of the Moscow Center for Arms Control, Anatoliy Dyakov, by Andrzey Rybak; place and date not given: "Still Under Control"]

[Text] [Rybak] Russia stores some 180 tonnes of weapons-grade plutonium, which is enough to produce 90,000 nuclear warheads. But the Russians go on producing plutonium. Why?

[Dyakov] This situation is far from logical to me also. Three reactors—two in Tomsk, one in Krasnoyarsk—are still producing weapons-grade plutonium. But they also generate electricity. If they were closed down, many people would be without electricity and heating. Yet, the government says there is another reason as well: The fuel used in the reactors cannot be stored for a long period. It has to be processed if even greater risks to humans and the environment are to be avoided.

[Rybak] Russia is in the midst of an economic crisis. Does this have an effect on the destruction of nuclear weapons, as laid down in the START Treaties?

[Dyakov] This is, indeed, a major financial problem. A total of 30,000 nuclear warheads are to be destroyed. Storing one gram of plutonium costs between $1 and $2 per year. The warheads contain a total of 60 tonnes of plutonium. This means that storing them alone would cost $60 to $120 million a year. The entire nuclear complex consumes some $1.5 billion per year. Using about 20 percent of capacity for disarmament would cost some $300 million per year. And the work will take 10 to 15 years.

[Rybak] The United States promised Russia financial support for disarmament.

[Dyakov] There is a $800 million fund. But this has been almost completely exhausted.

[Rybak] The rich threshold countries are very much interested in Russian nuclear scientists. How big is the danger that they might sell their knowledge?

[Dyakov] I, personally, do not know of any scientist of the "inner circle" who has emigrated to these countries.

[Rybak] But an increasing number of them lose their jobs. Scientists at the secret nuclear complex Arzamas-16 were on strike recently because their salaries had not been paid.

[Dyakov] The scientists' situation is very bleak. But I do not think this will lead to mass migration.

[Rybak] In Germany and Poland there have been several cases of smugglers being arrested with nuclear material.

[Dyakov] This was only slightly enriched uranium that is not suitable for weapons. As to the military nuclear complex, the situation is still under control.

[Rybak] Corruption is on the increase within the Russian Army. All kinds of weapons are being stolen and sold. Why not nuclear weapons?

[Dyakov] Your concern is justified. If everybody steals, including government personnel, you cannot expect the Army to be any better.

[Rybak] The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty will expire in 1995. What will happen then?

[Dyakov] I think that the Treaty will simply be extended. I hope that we will finally achieve a ban on tests.

[Rybak] In spite of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iraq and North Korea have almost finished developing the bomb. How can such things be prevented in the future?

[Dyakov] We have to put heavy pressure on such countries, impose economic sanctions. But we must also stop discriminating against the threshold countries. We cannot modernize our arsenals and prohibit them from developing the bomb. The First World must set an example by completely destroying its nuclear weapons.

Trade Minister Says U.S. Still Discriminates Against Russia

LD1501213794 Moscow Radio Moscow in Russian to Tajikistan 1700 GMT 15 Jan 94

[From the "Radio Slavyanka" program of the Russian Defense Ministry]

[Text] Despite significant progress in Russian-U.S. trade and economic relations, they are not yet free from the legacy of the Cold War, Oleg Davydov, Russia's minister for foreign economic relations, told Itar-Tass in Moscow.

He recalled that United States has not yet canceled the Jackson-Venik amendment which discriminates against Russia. The solution of a number of financial and commercial issues is tied to various political conditions and to progress in the implementation of market reforms in Russia.

The minister added that the policy of strict quantitative regulation of Russian imports is still in force. Russia, in the opinion of Oleg Davydov, should first and foremost seek the lifting of restrictions on the export of its goods to the United States and develop a mechanism for bilateral consultations.

Praise for Ambassador Pickering's Performance

PM1701142794 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 First Edition p 5

[Konstantin Eggert article: "Ambassador Thomas Pickering Is Clinton's Man in Moscow"]

[Text] "Pickering does not need an umbrella. He can make it through the rain"—this figurative description coming from a journalist gives you an extremely accurate idea of the U.S. ambassador in Moscow: 62-year old Thomas Pickering is a top-flight professional.

His involvement in Bill Clinton's talks with Boris Yeltsin is not only a case of paying tribute to the norms of protocol. Pickering's prestige among the U.S. political elite is exceptionally high. Despite having spent just over six months in the Russian capital, the ambassador's view of what is happening in our country carries weight in the White House and is given consideration by Clinton.

The unanimity of views is impressive. Americans, Russians, Israelis, and Arabs point to his brilliant analytical mind, good memory, rapid responses, and ability to conduct a conversation. "Pickering is a textbook diplomat," a U.S. correspondent in Moscow believes.

His post in Russia is the seventh ambassadorial posting for a lawyer and historian with two university degrees. He first heard himself addressed as "Mr. Ambassador" in 1974, when he was appointed head of the U.S. mission in Jordan.

Since then he has been to Nigeria, El Salvador, and Israel, led the U.S. mission to the United Nations, spent time in India, and lastly Moscow. "Late in the evening of 1 August 1990 I was attending a farewell dinner at the home of Britain's permanent UN representative," Pickering said. "The report of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait found me there. The Security Council worked the whole night through and at 0600 hours adopted the first resolution condemning Saddam Husayn." From that day on the diplomat became a television star. Journalists literally did not leave his side. The general opinion is that Pickering's openness played a cruel trick on him—Secretary of State James Baker ultimately decided that his subordinate's popularity was greater than his own. With the result that in 1992 Pickering was dispatched to protect U.S. interests in Delhi.

His appointment to Moscow heralded a kind of triumphal comeback for him. Fears whether Pickering, who had not previously tackled Russia, would be able to rapidly bring himself up to speed were dispelled. Smolensk Square does not conceal its respect for the ambassador. "He is very active and in just a few months has been able to set up such broad contacts at the highest level that some people who have spent two or three years in Moscow might envy him," an informed Russian diplomat said during a private conversation.

The Foreign Ministry believes that, in tandem with Richard Miles, the new minister-counselor (the number two man at the embassy) and an expert on Russia, Pickering is capable of doing a great deal to develop bilateral relations.

Of course, impeccable professionals do make blunders. It is rumored that, in the morning of 13 December, total confusion reigned at the traditional meeting of leading embassy staffers. No one was prepared for the dramatic Russian election result.

It is a desire to avoid these kinds of surprises in the future, rather than hypothetical disappointment with Yeltsin and Gaydar, that accounts for the Americans' desire to expand contacts with various political forces. Pickering carefully avoids answering questions like "Will you invite Zhirinovskiy for cocktails?", although he does not conceal the fact that his subordinates have had contacts with "liberal-democrat" representatives. [Communist Party of the Russian Federation leader] Gennadiy Zyuganov was one of the guests at a reception in Vice President Gore's honor.

"Less shock, more therapy"—since the 12 December elections this phrase, highlighting Washington's renewed approach to offering Russia financial and technical aid, has become a stock phrase. Pickering confirms that the money granted to our country will be used to create social support and professional retraining centers designed to ease the impact of future unemployment. Conversion, the reconfiguration of enterprises, and the creation of new jobs all figure in the programs funded by the West and the United States directly. "The attention given to the social aspect of reforms does not mean that we can forget to combat inflation," the ambassador remarked. "It is necessary to rid ourselves of this evil for other than economic reasons. Historical experience reminds us that the development of hyperinflation jeopardizes the existence of democracy."

Pickering is actively learning Russian (his sixth foreign language after French, Spanish, Arabic, Hebrew, and Swahili) and traveling a great deal—in just over seven months he has managed to visit St. Petersburg, Tula, Nizhniy Novgorod, Ulan-Ude, Irkutsk, and the Far East. On weekends the ambassador and his wife go out of town—they are very interested in Russian estate and church architecture.

The ambassador loves Baroque music (particularly Bach), collects books on military history and biographies of famous people, and loves reading thrillers, particularly spy novels.

"Some day Thomas Pickering will undoubtedly be deputy secretary of state," a U.S. journalist friend said when he learned that Clinton had appointed his personal friend and Russian specialist Strobe Talbott to this post at a reception in the vice president's honor. "Admittedly, he will most likely never get the post of head of the Department of State—that is generally given to political appointees."

Pickering Reiterates U.S. Support

LD1701191294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1807 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] The American administration has been following developments in the Russian leadership. A more detailed reaction can be expected from Washington after the official announcement of the makeup of a new Russian government, the U.S. ambassador in Moscow Thomas Pickering declared in an interview with Interfax on Monday.

He explained that his administration's position towards Russia's reforms did not depend on concrete personalities but was based on the principles they advocated.

Commenting on the First Vice Premier Yegor Gaydar's decision to resign, Pickering said that it did not take Washington aback, since rumors on Gaydar's possible resignation from the government had circulated long before his public announcement about it.

He voiced satisfaction with Gaydar's intention to carry on his duties in the Duma, where he led one of the major parliamentary factions, "Russia's Choice."

Pickering said that in the current situation the American administration regarded President Yeltsin's attitude to further reform as crucial. He recalled that at the recent summit, U.S. President Clinton had been firmly assured by Yeltsin that reform in Russia would be continued and stability there would be preserved.

Space Shuttle Launch With Cosmonaut Postponed

LD1701144994 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1411 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Semen Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—The launch of the U.S. "Discovery" space shuttle on which a Russian cosmonaut is to make the first flight was postponed from January 20 to February 3 because of malfunctions in the craft's engines, TASS learned from reliable sources in the Russian space business on Monday.

35 year-old Sergey Krikalyov is the first Russian cosmonaut to fly on board the U.S. space shuttle, according to a U.S.-Russian agreement.

Krikalyov made two space flights on the Russian "Mir" space station, the first lasted for 151 days in 1988-1989 and the second - 312 days from May 1991 to March 1992.

Krikalyov who was trained for the shuttle flight in the United States said the Russian training programme is better in many aspects.

Krikalyov, who is a computer engineer, said the computers installed on the "Discovery" had been designed long ago and are considerably inferior to the computer centre onboard the "Mir".

He also complained about an inconvenient work schedule in orbit - in two shifts. There is only one sleeping-bag for two crew members and they have to sleep in turn, according to him.

Krikalyov was surprised that after the training programme was completed astronauts did not have to pass any exams or tests. It is the captain who bears all responsibility for the flight preparations.

This is the second delay in the launch of the space shuttle. Initially it was planned for last November 10, but was also postponed.

Kozyrev Comments on 'Partnership for Peace'

LD1501161094 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1504 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelyov]

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—The Partnership for Peace program recently approved by the NATO summit in Brussels is an important step forward in the development of partnership between Russia, the United States and other NATO countries, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told correspondents on Friday.

It seems NATO membership of new states could be the most simple and quick solution to the problem, this is naturally their sovereign right. However, swift implementation of this right would result in new barriers in Europe, said the minister.

"NATO has listened to us, Central and East European nations, it listened to Russia, Boris Yeltsin who said in Poland it is the right of each state to decide whether or not to join NATO; but there are realities that require a more well-considered approach," he noted.

The Brussels decision provides for a long period of partnership which will help concentrate efforts and determine the fate of Europe. The problem has been discussed with the U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher at the Moscow summit. The U.S. and Russian presidents exchanged their opinions on the issue and expressed satisfaction with the program of Partnership for Peace, said Kozyrev.

It is too early to say what the period will end with. It may be so that many states, possibly, Russia (it is not excluded) will join NATO. But the period will not obligatory be a preparatory one. Other options are possible as well.

Broader security systems may be created and the Council of North Atlantic Cooperation may be consolidated. The more so, in the opinion of the Russian side, all areas should be developed parallelly. It is a new quality of partnership and not new membership in NATO that matters. Kozyrev said they should concentrate on partnership, fill it with specific content and see the final result. The most important is stability and cooperation in Europe.

Grachev Assesses Relations With NATO

LD1601191194 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1520 GMT 16 Jan 94

[From the 'Radio Slavyanka' program of the Russian Defense Ministry]

[Excerpts] Continuing the theme of international military political events, I would like to draw your attention to the results of the NATO meeting in Brussels last week. [passage omitted] Listen to how the Russian Defense Minister Army General Pavel Grachev assesses the situation.

[Begin Grachev recording] We take an understanding attitude toward the sovereign right of every state, including those of eastern Europe, to choose a path for ensuring its own security. Such a choice could be participation in military political alliances. We would not like the states of central and eastern Europe, or the Baltic region, to speculate on a mythical threat from Russia. We do not understand their aspiration to defend themselves from Russia by membership of NATO. We, for our part, welcome the decision by the meeting of the NATO council, at the foreign minister level, in Brussels on 3 December, to remove this question from the agenda.

We are supporters of the kind of path which leads to a genuine all-European system of security, that is, collective actions—but not by the criteria of belonging to blocs—with a view to preventing and settling the crises and conflicts currently convulsing Europe. We believe that security and international stability should be indivisible and rely on all-European structures. Russia takes as its premise that our relations with NATO should be richer and develop across a broad range of interaction. Russia's rapprochement with NATO, it seems to us, should proceed at a rapid pace. The east Europeans could, of course, also join this process.

We have met with Mr. Woerner, the president has met him, and I was there, and we reached this agreement—that we set up groups, they have already been set up, expert groups of specialists, from NATO on the one side and Russia on the other. Over the course of January we are going to study a plan for Russia to cooperate with NATO, and sometime in January, perhaps in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, where I have been invited, so as fully to explain every text of our military doctrine to the members of NATO and other interested persons, and maybe we'll sign this agreement there, if the president instructs me to do so, on behalf of the government. This matter has been studied. In addition, I have had a meeting with the commander in chief of the joint armed forces in Europe, an American general, with whom we also agreed during January to study an agreement, at a purely military level—the other one was at a military political level, while this is at a purely military level—between the commander in chief of NATO's joint armed forces in Europe, and the Russian armed forces. [end recording]

Bank's Solovov on Inter-Bank Agreement With Belarus

LD1601194994 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1743 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] In an interview with Interfax, Vice Governor of Russia's Central Bank Vyacheslav Solovov categorically refuted Gaydar's assertions that the Russian-Belarusian inter-bank agreement would reproduce chaos in the monetary sphere.

He said that the inter-bank agreement did not have anything to do with the unification of the monetary systems. This may happen when both Russian and Belarusian governments take a corresponding decision, he said. So far, the Russian and Belarusian prime ministers have only signed a statement on the forthcoming, not actual, unification of the monetary systems, he

continued. Moreover, the agreement envisages a detailed analysis of all aspects of both countries' monetary emission and credit policies.

Solovov believes that Gaydar deliberately distorted facts and that the financial policy, pursued by the government has pushed the Russian financial system on the verge of ruin. Moreover, "many people claiming to be experts are in fact dilettantes looking for a way out of the crisis in the banking policy, instead of concentrating on economic restructuring," he said.

He stated that Gaydar's resignation was not motivated by the inter-bank agreement. "Gaydar used it as a pretext for covering up more complicated problems," he said.

An attentive reader of the inter-bank agreement will not fail to see that the actual unification of the monetary systems will occur when the purchasing power of the Belarusian monetary unit will become equivalent to the Russian ruble. Only then will it become possible to exchange the national banknotes according to the 1 to 1 rate. This work is already being done by experts of ministries, by the Committee for Prices and by the Central Bank. This requires a serious analysis not slogans," he said.

To quote Solovov, Russian industrial enterprises owe Belarus 211 Bn rubles (as of December 1, 1993). If this money were repaid to Belarus, the exchange rate between the Russian and Belarusian rubles would not be so striking, he said. The Russian enterprises' insolvency was largely caused by the economic policy pursued by the government in 1992-93. It had a strong impact on the exchange rate and strongly influenced the economic processes, stated Solovov.

Shokhin on Merging Monetary Systems With Belarus

LD1801113694 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1019 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By BUSINESS-TASS]

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—"The merger of Russian and Belarussian monetary systems mainly concerns non-cash turnover," Aleksandr Shokhin, vice-premier of the Russian government, said in an interview with ITAR-TASS.

"Unlike Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, which used old Soviet cash money and attempted to accelerate the merger of the monetary systems, Belarus did nothing of the kind. Now, all mechanisms of the merger, including both monetary and economic systems, should be worked out. This concerns interbank relations, budgets, customs systems, etc.," Shokhin said.

He went on to say that Belarus is, perhaps, the only country of the former Soviet Union which encourages the development of mixed forms of property. This process of encouraging mutual interests should be strengthened. Shokhin pointed out that ill- considered political statements should not impede real possibilities for integration which might be advantageous for Russia.

Kozyrev on Talks With Acting Moldovan Foreign Minister

LD1401211694 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1554 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Jan—Ion Butnaru, Moldova's acting foreign minister, today ended a visit to Moscow that lasted three days. In the course of the visit, I. Butnaru held intensive talks at the Russian Federation's Foreign Ministry with Andrey Kozyrev, Russia's foreign minister, Sergey Krylov, deputy foreign minister and head of the Department of CIS countries. He also talked to Michael Emerson, the head of the European Union's delegation in Moscow.

A wide range of issues on Russian-Moldovan relations and assistance to Russia in the settlement of the Dniester problem were the main topics at the talks with Andrey Kozyrev held on Thursday [13 January].

This is a most complex process, and the main thing for us, Andrey Kozyrev told journalists at the end of the talks, is to persuade both sides—the Moldovan Government and the Dniester leadership—to seek ways of achieving political accord and political solutions. He described the conversation that took place as a useful and informative conversation which proceeded "in a professional and business-like manner."

Answering a question from an ITAR-TASS correspondent, Andrey Kozyrev said that the Dniester problem would be examined at the Russian-U.S. summit, which is currently taking place in Moscow. We are conducting a dialogue with the United States and other countries since the region is a matter of concern for the CSCE and United Nations. At all bilateral meetings, we are seeking to expand the range of countries involved to enhance our efforts in resolving similar problems.

Talks With Estonia Postponed; Delegation Head Ill

LD1701144494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1419 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Krivoshey]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—Russia and Estonia have agreed to postpone their talks which were due to resume outside Moscow on January 18 until a later date.

A Russian Foreign Ministry official said that the talks had been postponed because of the illness of the head of the Russian delegation. The talks are expected to resume in a week's time.

Latvia Opens Consulate in Pskov Oblast

LD1601145494 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By correspondent N. Nedosekina from Pskov; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Pskov has become the first oblast in Russia where the Latvian Republic has opened its consulate. This is not accidental. The whole state border between Russia and Latvia goes through Pskov oblast.

A lot is being expected from the new consulate. It will make it possible for people who have been suddenly divided by state borders to preserve kinship and friendly ties. In the past one had to travel from the border to St. Petersburg to get a visa.

Strengthening economic contacts between Russia and Latvia is another important thing. Around 40 joint ventures are operating in Pskov oblast alone.

Today's event is the first sign. Estonia's consulate and an office of the Russian Foreign Ministry are to be opened in Pskov in the future.

Churkin Stresses Importance of Geneva Talks on Bosnia

LD1701185194 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1807 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] The next meeting of the warring Bosnian sides to be held in Geneva on Tuesday is "extremely important; it may prove to be decisive from the viewpoint of viability of the present plan for a settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina." The special envoy of Russia's president, Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin, said so in an interview with INTERFAX before his departure for Geneva.

According to him, "very intensive" consultations were conducted in the past few days in the framework of preparations for the Geneva round of talks. This issue was discussed at the meeting between the Russian and American Presidents in Moscow, and at the parallel negotiations between Secretary of State Warren Christopher and the head of Russian diplomacy, Andrey Kozyrev.

According to the diplomat, progress reached in the talks on territorial concessions is the principal positive factor in the efforts to resolve the crisis. Some 33.5 percent of the territory in Bosnia-Herzegovina claimed by the Muslims have been guaranteed to them at last. It was a key demand of the European Union, and a top- priority issue at the talks, Churkin said.

Army Paper Cites UK 'Caution' on Bosnia Air Strikes

PM1401132994 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 3

[Sergey Sidorov report under "Yesterday" rubric: "UK Defense Secretary Favors Cautious NATO Approach to Bosnia"]

[Text] NATO should show great caution regarding potential air strikes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This opinion was expressed in an interview on BBC radio by UK Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind, commenting on the decisions of the session of the North Atlantic bloc council which has ended in Brussels. He stressed that London feels no special enthusiasm for the policy of intimidation by air strikes because British servicemen form part of the NATO forces on the ground engaged in delivering humanitarian aid to the population.

Ending the war in former Yugoslavia is not the task of the United Nations: It cannot be achieved by military measures from outside, the head of the military department pointed out. The international contingent's objective is to ensure the normal delivery of humanitarian aid to tens of thousands of innocent people.

Submarines Being Sold to DPRK for Scrap Metal

OW1701140494 Vladivostok Radiostantsiya Tikhiy Okean Maritime Network in Russian 0815 GMT 14 Jan 94

[From the "Pacific Ocean" Program]

[Text] Four Russian submarines, currently in the Pacific Fleet, will leave Russian territorial waters in the near future to join the naval forces of North Korea. TOKYO SHIMBUN newspaper reported in its evening issue [date not given] that a contract on export of the submarines has already been signed by representatives of Moscow and Pyongyang. Quoting a high-ranking source in the Pacific Fleet command, the newspaper claims that talks with North Korea on delivery of four submarines have been conducted by representatives of the Russian naval forces in complete secrecy.

The sum of contract is not known. Currently, the submarines schedule to leave for DPRK are being used for training purposes and are practically unsuitable for combat missions. They were all built in the sixties. A source in the Pacific Fleet command assessed that after necessary repairs, the submarines would join the North Korean combat subunits. However, it is not out of the question that they would be dismantled, and the spare parts used to repair other North Korean submarines.

To Be Disassembled in Japan

SK1501063594 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1000 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] According to a source from the Russian Naval Forces Command, old submarines will be sold to the

DPRK. However, they are unable to be used for military force. They will be disassembled in Japan and used for scrap metal.

'Specialists' on Reusing Submarines

PM1701164594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 94 First Edition p 4

[Aleksandr Sychev report: "Kim Il-song Has Bought From Us Submarines That Cannot Sail"]

[Text] North Korea is experiencing an acute shortage of raw materials for smelting steel and is purchasing old weapons for scrap whenever the opportunity arises. Four Russian submarines are destined for that country's metallurgical plants in the near future.

The submarines in question are SS-60's, known in the West by the designation "Foxtrot." These diesel-powered torpedo-armed submarines were constructed in the Soviet Union in the 1960's and have already completed their intended service life. Of the 40 or so submarines of this class which remain in the Russian Navy, some are still used as training vessels. The rest, however, are permanently laid up and are quietly poisoning the environment at naval bases.

Navy commanders have been authorized to sell off these decommissioned vessels on their own initiative. Because Russia lacks adequate production capacity suited to preparing warships for melting down, and also because the country's economic position boosts the attractiveness of freely convertible currency, foreign buyers naturally have priority rights.

The contract to sell four decommissioned submarines to North Korean buyers was signed by the Russian Pacific Fleet command.

The Japanese newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN has conjectured that, having obtained the submarines, North Korea will carry out repairs and put them into service in its navy. In the opinion of Russian specialists, however, it would be economically disadvantageous to carry out a complete overhaul of the "Foxtrots." Moreover, under existing rules all armaments and guidance systems will be dismantled before the submarines are dispatched to North Korea.

Navy Denies Sale

LD1801100094 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0335 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] The press office of the Russian Navy has denied a report in a Japanese newspaper [TOKYO SHIMBUN on 16 January]. The report says that the Pacific Fleet has sold to North Korea four submarines which, after repair, will join the DPRK naval forces. The press office of the Russian Navy said that a contract had indeed been signed for the sale of 12 obsolete diesel submarines with a Japanese firm. However, at present these submarines are in a condition which rules out their being used for combat purposes. Moreover, Russian experts will be monitoring the complete dismantling of the submarines.

ROK, Japan Consider Repatriation of Sakhalin Citizens

LD1401185894 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] It is necessary to make a decision concerning possible return of the Sakhalin Koreans to their historic homeland and provide compensation for moral and material damage inflicted on them, according to the results of an opinion poll. This is the conclusion drawn by members of a joint Japanese-South Korean delegation, on a visit in Sakhalin.

According to various information, 30,000-40,000 ethnic Koreans are living on the island now.

Deputy chief of the Japanese Foreign Ministry's Northeastern Asia Department Fudzi Arata and chief of the Korean Foreign Ministry's Northeastern Department Sin Gak-su were at the head of this joint delegation. Yevgeniy Lishakov, an official from the Russian Foreign Ministry's Asia Department, and representative of the State Federation Committee Gerasim Yugay attended the negotiations of the delegation with the Association of the Sakhalin Koreans as supervisors.

During the pre-war years the Japanese Government deported the Koreans to the island of Sakhalin by force to fulfill hard labor needs and after the defeat in WWII they left them there. For more than 40 years the Sakhalin Koreans have had no opportunity to write to their relatives and have had no information from their homeland because the former USSR recognized only the Korean People's Democratic Republic and pursued the policy of the Korean population's assimilation.

The Coordinating Council of the Association of the Sakhalin Koreans has formulated its demands in an address to the governments of Japan, South Korea, and Russia. These include: Re-settlement of old people (born before 1930) to South Korea for permanent residence, granting accommodation and benefits to them, granting of Russian pensions and benefits to the people under repatriation, and payment of compensation totalling 10 Mn yen for the inflicted moral and material damage to every Sakhalin Korean who preferred to stay in Russia. In addition, they are asking the governments of South Korea and the Russian Federation to sign an intergovernmental agreement on dual citizenship for the Sakhalin Koreans.

Participants of the consultations held in Sakhalin also agreed to transform bilateral talks on ethnic Koreans into tripartite ones, having included Russia into this process.

Talks With Japan Suspended 'Indefinitely'

MK1501124094 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Anastasiya Romashkevich report: "Territorial Disputes With Japan. Talking About Derailed Talks Is Premature"]

[Text] On Thursday evening REUTER reported a Japanese Foreign Ministry statement on indefinitely suspending Russian-Japanese talks on territorial demarcation. It is noteworthy that this report coincided with the first address by Vladimir Shumeyko as Federal Assembly speaker [as published; Shumeyko is Federation Council speaker], in which he made it clear that there is no territorial problem and that the islands belong to Russia. Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Panov comments on the situation at KOMMERSANT-DAILY's request.

By the time of Boris Yeltsin's visit to Tokyo in October, when it was decided to hold a regular meeting of a working group on the peace treaty (it discussed the territorial question among other things), experts had not been in session for more than a year. At the time the meeting was tentatively scheduled for December. Now, however, according to REUTER, Moscow decided to postpone the talks "indefinitely," citing the fact that many Russian politicians were involved in the election campaign.

According to Mr. Panov, this report, which was published a few days ago in a Japanese newspaper, was news to him. Incidentally, the diplomat noted, a number of Japanese mass media have already refuted this information. The meeting, indeed, is unlikely to be held in January, because the sides have yet to resolve a number of technical matters related to its organization. The Russian Foreign Ministry, however, has not sent proposals to Tokyo for an "indefinite" postponement, Mr. Panov said. Moreover, talking about postponement is simply irrelevant because no specific decisions on possible dates of the peace treaty group's meetings had been made earlier. Mr. Panov pointed out that to all appearances a Japanese delegation would arrive in Moscow in February. The meeting's precise date will be announced "in the near future."

Commentary

When a spokesman for the Japanese Foreign Ministry said that talks on the territorial problem were allegedly postponed at Moscow's request, he cited his counterparts from the Russian Foreign Ministry. They allegedly attributed the delay to the fact that their representatives, many of whom were involved in the election campaign, were not ready for the talks. We may add that the supervisor of the Japanese sector at the Russian Foreign Ministry has also changed in the wake of the elections: Georgiy Kunadze left for Seoul as Russian ambassador, and Aleksandr Panov has yet to get into the swing of things. After all, it is not so important whether the talks will take place in January or February. Rumors about the postponement are only a sign of Tokyo's concern about the results of such talks. The key word here—"election campaign"—brings to mind the fact that Russia's foreign policy has been more and more affected by the "Zhirinovskiy factor;" he, having succeeded in his nationalist rhetoric in general, has repeatedly said that the Kremlin is allegedly ready just about to "give up the islands to Japan."

At a time when economic populism literally costs a lot and is constrained by the realities of the Russian budget deficit and ever- lasting inflation, political, or rather foreign policy, populism may just as well be chosen as a weapon in the struggle. All the more so because not only has it brought Liberal Democratic Party of Russia leaders great dividends, it has also enabled them to leave the voters in the dark as to the party's economic program.

As a matter of fact, addressing the Federal Assembly, its new chief, Vladimir Shumeyko [as published], having successfully evaded all acute angles regarding economic policy, made a point of voicing his support for Viktor Chernomyrdin on the South Kuril islands problem: Kunashir, Iturup, Shikotan and the Habomai islands "belong to Russia, and there is no question of their transfer." While he acknowledged that his view diverged from Moscow's official point of view (which boils down to admitting that "the problem exists"), it is clear that any talks about the islands are doomed to a stalemate. Nikita Khrushchev, who officially promised two of the islands to the Japanese, has probably been the only politician who could act without paying heed to the voters. It is also evident that a period started by Mikhail Gorbachev, when the fact of recognizing the existence of a territorial problem (without visible breakthroughs in its settlement) was modus operandi in relations with Japan, is drawing to a close. No arguments about "fostering cooperation on the basis of compromise in the settlement of territorial disputes" will work any longer given a formidable nationalist opposition.

Japanese 'At a Loss'

PM1701133194 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 First Edition p 4

[Sergey Agafonov report: "Talks Postponed, But Japanese Shocked by Shumeyko's Statements"]

[Text] Tokyo—Late last year Moscow and Tokyo agreed to hold at the end of January a meeting of the bilateral group which is working on a peace treaty, as well as studying the territorial issue. The meeting was of fundamental importance for the Japanese side since it was to attest that, following the parliamentary elections, there had been no change in Russia's acknowledgment of the territorial problem as a real, pressing problem. It became known yesterday evening that the bilateral meeting has been postponed indefinitely on the Russian side's initiative.

The reasons given have plunged the Japanese into profound depression: The Russian side gave domestic political factors linked with the new parliament as the reason. In Tokyo this was interpreted unequivocally as meaning that the political changes taking place in Russia do not as yet allow Moscow to clearly make up its mind about Japan. And this means that the accords secured during Boris Yeltsin's visit to Japan in October are, as it were, up in the air.

Japanese concern intensified after the first press conference given by Vladimir Shumeyko, who has just been elected speaker of the Russian parliament's upper chamber. News agencies reported that the new speaker said that the disputed islands are Russian territory and cannot and will not be surrendered to anyone. According to Shumeyko, there is no question of the ownership and future of the islands of Kunashir, Iturup, Habomai, and Shikotan at all. What is more, the speaker pointed out that the government and cabinet of ministers apparatus backs the stance espoused by Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, which boils down to the idea that the territorial question does not exist in Russian-Japanese relations. But the most significant point in Shumeyko's statements, as reported by news agency channels, is a previously unheard-of statement: The speaker said that the Russian Government's stance on territorial matters is at variance with Russia's official position.

Shumeyko virtually admitted that not only does the Russian president not have the last word or the deciding say as far as the parliament is concerned but even as far as members of the cabinet, which the president himself formed, are concerned.

People in Japan have not so far commented on this revelation—evidently they are at a loss to find the necessary words and phrases straightaway. But ultimately it is not a question of Japanese comment but of the fact that Moscow seems to see nothing bad in this situation.

Moscow Radio Commentary on Iran's Nuclear Programs

NC1501093594 Moscow Radio Moscow in Persian 1600 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Sergey Viktorov commentary]

[Text] Iran has once again stressed the peaceful nature of its nuclear program. [Word indistinct] Reza Amrollahi, official representative of the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization [IAEO], speaking to an IRNA correspondent on Wednesday [12 January], said that a recent report in the U.S. magazine "U.S.A. TODAY" is sheer lies and (?part of a) U.S. plot against the world of Islam. Sergey Viktorov writes on this:

We should recall that normally information by the special services of the United States form the basis of reports such as those that are being (?recently heard) in a number of Western countries. Taking into consideration the special characteristics of U.S.-Iranian relations, it is difficult to consider such information to be realistic and unbiased.

Nevertheless, according to known facts, in their effort to portray the Islamic Republic as a country that has been (?rejected) by world society, the U.S. special services are willing to ignore conclusions that have been drawn by impartial international experts, something which Reza Amrollahi justly pointed out in his news conference.

Last fall a group of experts from the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] inspected all the nuclear installations on Iranian territory and did not find any proof that Iran is manufacturing nuclear weapons. It should be noted that all similar IAEA inspections have so far yielded the same conclusion. Moreover, it should be added that Tehran has never expressed its intention to leave the Nuclear Nonproliferation Pact and has also signed the agreement on (?banning) chemical weapons.

Thus it appeared that the exploitation of this issue could be stopped. But this did not happen. The United States has succeeded in its efforts to convince its partners in the G-7 to join in boycotting the exports to Iran of so-called technology that can be used for dual purposes. Tehran, which was in a technoglically unfavorable position, requested assistance from Russia and China to complete the construction of incomplete nuclear energy installations, and specifically (?agreed) on the purchase of two Russian-built nuclear reactors and one Chinese nuclear reactor. However, this rekindled a more intense campaign in the West regarding Iran's ambitious nuclear programs. Russia's assurances were in vain. Russia pointed out that Russian-Iranian cooperation in the field of nuclear energy would be strictly within the framework of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Pact and under the constant supervision of the IAEA.

Of course, the United States wants a more moderate government to come to power in Tehran. However, the traditional anti-U.S. remarks by the current Iranian leaders do not leave any chance for a positive change in the situation, and it seems that the West will thus continue to exploit the issue of Iran's imaginary nuclear threat.

One can agree with Reza Amrollahi's remarks in his recent interview. However, Tehran's wish to (?link) itself with the world of Islam, which can recently be seen, is also reflected in these remarks. If one can [word indistinct] speak about a type of U.S. plot, it is highly possible that this plot is only against Iran. But this plot must be regarded as a confrontation between two unreconcilable ideologies.

Zhirinovskiy Views 'German Interests'

AU1401215494 Munich DEUTSCHE NATIONAL-ZEITUNG in German 14 Jan 94 pp 3-4

[Article by Russian Liberal Democratic Party Chairman Vladimir Zhirinovskiy: "What Are Germany's Interests?"—introductory passage by DEUTSCHE NATIONAL-ZEITUNG]

[Text] The smear campaign against the winner of the Russian parliamentary elections, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, worst of all in the German opinion industry, is unprecedented. The Springer concern, which represents Israel's interests, has taken the lead in this respect. Springer's BILD is not even ashamed to write: "Russian Hitler—I Was His Sex Slave." At the same time, Peter Scholl-Latour, who was once a foreign legionnaire and then press spokesman of the separatist Hoffmann government in Saarland, and as such fought for France, describes in BILD the "great danger" that Zhirinovskiy would return Koenigsberg [Kaliningrad] or northeastern Prussia. In that case, Bonn should by no means "give in to Zhirinovskiy's pressure." In DER SPIEGEL, Rudolf Augstein is very concerned about the allegedly-threatened Poland, which had considered "its present western border with the Germans secure." It is true that we could not "wage war alone" against Moscow to protect the Oder-Neisse line, "nor can (Poland) protect it alone.... We must back the country, even though we cannot give it contractual guarantees, as the British did in 1939." If future generations eventually read in the history books about the great concern that Germany might get back some of its territory, of which it was criminally robbed, they will think the current generation must have been crazy. In the following article, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy describes the situation as it really is in an exclusive for DEUTSCHE NATIONAL-ZEITUNG and DEUTSCHE WOCHEN-ZEITUNG. We call upon our readers to distribute this newspaper and this article as widely as possible, and thus contribute to finding the truth:

As chairman of the strongest Russian political party, the Liberal Democratic Party, which won the parliamentary elections in December, I am trying to find out which German interests could have caused the federal foreign minister to refuse to grant me an entry visa.

It is generally known that hundreds of thousands of sham asylum-seekers registered by German courts and authorities have not been deported. Jewish citizens from Russia and the CIS republics are promptly granted visas for the Federal Republic upon request to stay here indefinitely and take advantage of the excellent German social welfare network. Hundreds of thousands of foreigners cross the Oder-Neisse border and come to Germany illegally, and many of them call for and are granted the "right to stay," even though such a right does not exist in the German legal system.

No Special Role for Germany

According to the calculations of prominent Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] politicians, the German taxpayer has probably paid 100 billion German marks [DM] over the last three years. My stay in Germany would have ended before 11 January, the opening session of the Duma, and would not have cost the German taxpayer a single mark.

My pro-German attitude may appear unusual, if we recall the visits of many politicians who have appeared in the Federal Republic over the past decades, criticized the German people, and were generously rewarded for so doing. By the same token, even some media in Germany say that "citing German interests" as a reason for refusing entry to me involves many different considerations, because "regrettably," I "did not attack the Federal Republic, but even courted it" (STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG 30 December, 1993).

Regarding my way of thinking, I ask the Germans to understand that, as a Russian, I was not brainwashed for re-education. So I do not see why the German people, half a century after World War II, should be condemned to a special role. I do not see why Germans born after 1945, or not yet born, should assume collective responsibility and collective liability.

Smear Campaign as in the War

The winners of World War II did not repeat the "basic mistake" they made after World War I, but staffed the opinion industry in Germany, after 1945, with reliable persons of their choice. When reading, hearing, or seeing the German media spread slander against me, I get the impression that I am at war, or as if war were imminent. There is no abuse or defamation that would not be leveled against me.

My family had to make many sacrifices in the fight against fascism. However, the yellow press in Germany has touted me, in many ways, as the "Russian Hitler." Even though the elections in Russia were not too free in my view, but were still freer than they often are in the "free West," the Russian people have been disparaged. My voters did not know what they were doing, claims the media, and were seduced by demagogy and even hypnosis. To fill the cup to the brim, I, being a passionate animal lover, have been denounced as an arrant tormenter of animals, enjoying even dog fights. In this respect also, the truth is exactly the opposite of what the media says. I am—and I have always said so—an absolute opponent of any kind of animal fights and generally any cruelty to animals.

Everlasting Friendship With Germany

It is correct that I do not think the Oder-Neisse line is history's last word, nor do I think that it is cause for alarm. Rather, I was amazed—and I was not the only one—that in the Two-Plus-Four negotiations, Bonn, under the pressure of Western "friends," did not even suggest a peaceful revision regarding territories west of the Oder, such as Stettin [Szczecin] or Swinemuende [Swinoujscie]. It should be remembered that Warsaw occupied these territories by coup de main, which was not approved by the then victors.

If Russia and Germany had a common border—in eastern Prussia, for instance—this would by no means lead to the extinction of Poland as a state, as malicious people have insinuated. Discussing all German-Russian matters in cordial harmony with my friend, Gerhard Frey, is no sin. However, our friendship does not justify

hateful insinuations "that Zhirinovskiy and Frey are redrawing the map of Europe from Berlin or Munich" (SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG of 30 December 1993).

The peaceful revision of borders through negotiations is in line with international law. My policy is oriented toward lasting partnership and everlasting friendship between Russia and Germany. This requires unlimited sovereignty, full equality, and mutual non- interference.

In Russia, German language and culture are rising fast again. United Germany is the heart of Europe. It is with great sympathy that I watch the German language's apparently tortuous journey until it is finally given the rank due to it in international bodies dominated by the West.

Bad Blood Through Entry Ban

Just as it was impossible for Metternich to prevent a small German unity, and for Mitterrand, the smallest German unity, it is a hopeless venture, over the long run, to chain the German giant and deprive him of his rights.

The entry ban imposed on me has also created bad blood in the Russian Army, which backs me. I advocate the withdrawal of our troops from the territory of the former GDR. But how can other foreign troops continue to be deployed in Germany, and the Bundeswehr be subdivided into multinational units under foreign command?

My policy is opposed to every degradation and special treatment of Germany. We want a normal and sound, a vigorous and German Germany, naturally also with a strong national army under a German general staff.

Our Friendship Is Directed Against Noone

Our friendship is directed against noone, but is the ideal guarantee of wellbeing, self-determination, and peace. These goals cannot violate Germany's national interests.

My model is Bismarck. His great social laws on the one hand, and his ingenious foreign policy on the other, have made the creator of the small German empire immortal. A renewal of the Reinsurance Treaty, which was one of the masterpieces of the great chancellor, would have spared our nations World War I and thus probably also World War II. Such insanity must never repeat itself!

Even though I highly respect President Yeltsin, I will run in the next presidential elections, and I will win. To be sure, the Foreign Ministry in Bonn—which hopefully will be in Berlin very soon—must show consideration for many things. But as it is, Russians and Germans are the greatest European peoples, and Russia is the world's greatest state.

Germany Must Live

Being a democrat, I of course respect the freely elected German federal government. Neither an entry ban nor the defamatory media campaign can make me change my clearly pro-German policy course. The Russian people certainly cannot be influenced against me by all the distortions of news agencies and press media, television and radio stations from Germany. What is rather unavoidable is this: "What will politicians do if Zhirinovskiy, who can today be refused an entry visa, sits in the Moscow Kremlin as president in two years?" (DIE WELT of 31 December 1993).

The false reports on me will, however, contribute to reviving anti-German resentment in Russia. My compatriots are wondering why a consistent friend of the Germans such as myself should be one of the main targets of so many malicious attacks from the media that spreads its venom from Germany.

I also appeal to the intelligence, admired worldwide, of the Germans, the people of poets and thinkers. In the summer of 1992, I went to Germany for comprehensive talks with Mr. Frey, and at a joint news conference in Munich and a rally of the German People's Union [DVU] in Thuringia, I expounded my theses on everlasting German-Russian friendship. In the spring of 1993, Mr. Frey and I were at similar meetings in Moscow, the Liberal Democratic Party Congress, and a ceremony on the occasion of my birthday. In the fall of 1993, we repeated this on a large scale at the DVU mass rally in the Passau Nibelungen Hall.

The Work of Intelligence Services

The speech I held in Nibelungen Hall is accurately recorded on the video "Passau 93: Germany Must Live". There has probably hardly ever been a non-German politician over the past decades who has affirmed and defended the German people's vital rights and interests as clearly and thoroughly as I have done.

Every thinking person will therefore know what to make of those people who, citing an alleged "intelligence service recording," imply that I intend to annihilate Germany and, prior to its "total destruction," extort huge reparation payments, until it becomes a "poor country."

I have very often commented to DEUTSCHE NATIONAL-ZEITUNG on the fatal work and terrible goals of intelligence services that set us at one another's throats and try to destroy our friendship.

Nothing has changed about my goals—Germans and Russians in fraternal unity and everlasting friendship!

Political Issues

Government Meeting Postponed Due To Ongoing Reshuffle

LD1801092094 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0739 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Oleg Velichko]

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—The Russian government postponed a meeting scheduled for Tuesday [18 January] because reshuffling of the government has not yet been completed, TASS learned from government administration.

The meeting was to discuss the situation in the aluminum- producing industry and export quotas for 1994.

Yeltsin, Chernomyrdin Discuss Composition of Government

LD1801101594 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0920 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 18 Jan—A meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin began in the Kremlin at midday [0900 GMT]. This is one of the regular Tuesday meetings. They are expected to discuss a draft presidential decree on the new composition of the Russian government. [passage omitted]

ITAR-TASS correspondents have learned from trustworthy sources that the meeting between the president and the prime minister will continue until 1400 hours [1100 GMT] and that Boris Yeltsin will today give final confirmation to the government line-up.

Soskovets To Participate in Talks

LD1801130494 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1148 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin began his meeting at midday Tuesday [18 January] with Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. Expected to also take part is first Vice Premier Oleg Soskovets. They are to make a final decision on the government's new composition.

Government sources say that Soskovets, as the first deputy prime minister, will continue to be responsible for industry, transport, the military-industrial complex, and the fuel and energy complex.

The meeting of the government commission responsible for solving urgent problems, which was planned for Tuesday at 3 p.m., has been postponed for an indefinite period. The meeting, which was to discuss measures on how to stabilize the situation in the aluminum industry, investment funds in the power industry, and export quotas for 1994, is likely to take place next week.

Talks Continue

LD1801140294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1338 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin has not agreed on the new composition of the government so far and their meeting continues, TASS learned from well-informed sources in the Kremlin.

It was initially reported that the meeting which began at noon [0900 GMT] would last two hours, but the source said Yeltsin and Chernomyrdin continued consultations after lunch break.

Yushenkov Says Fedorov Will Resign, Chubays Will Stay

LD1601163094 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin took "calmly" Yegor Gaydar's decision to resign from the post of first vice premier, Sergey Yushenkov, the Russia's Choice secretary, told Interfax.

Yushenkov announced that on Sunday morning the bureau of the Russia's Choice faction had held a meeting with Gaydar's participation and unanimously supported Gaydar's decision, aware that he could not bear the responsibility for the policy he does not support.

Yushenkov said that Gaydar would concentrate on his parliamentary activity and on the creation of a new party on the basis of Russia's Choice.

To quote Yushenkov, Finance Minister Boris Fedorov is also planning to quit the government. Like Gaydar, "he cannot bear the responsibility for a policy which will inevitable spur inflation".

Anatoliy Chubays will stay in the government, said Yushenkov.

In the new situation, the parliamentary committee for the budget, planning and taxes should be led by Russia's Choice representative Aleksandr Pochinok, although earlier Russia's Choice had not objected to this committee being led by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's nearest associate Mikhail Zadornov.

More on Chubays as Vice Premier

MK1401121094 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 1

[Aleksandr Bekker report under the "Edicts" rubric: "Chubays Stays Regardless of Quota. President Makes His Choice"]

[Text] According to an INTERFAX report, which was confirmed by a government source, Anatoliy Chubays,

chairman of the State Property Committee, has been appointed deputy head of the Council of Ministers by presidential edict. By doing so Boris Yeltsin veered away from his edict No. 66 signed 10 January, whereby Viktor Chernomyrdin was to name the candidacies of his two first deputies and two "ordinary" deputies by 17 January. Boris Yeltsin moved Anatoliy Chubays outside the edict's scope by effectively making him the head of government's fifth deputy.

According to trustworthy reports, initially the prime minister did not consider the State Property Committee chairman as a candidate for his "deputy." Moreover, under that same edict No. 66, the status of the State Property Committee in the government structure was lower than that of a ministry; this meant that its chief would "fall" by as many as two rungs. It seems that there were two reasons for Boris Yeltsin's somewhat unexpected decision. First, Anatoliy Chubays has told the president and the prime minister, apparently off the record, that he did not want to be reduced to a figure that is moved too energetically on the political board. All the more so because presently the State Property Committee has to cope with a plethora of reforms: the completion of the small and large-scale privatization programs, including the voucher-based stage that must end by 1 July; the establishment of control over state-owned enterprises; and the introduction of the restructuring and bankruptcy procedures. Second, Boris Yeltsin's edict coincided with the visit of Bill Clinton, whose delegation includes Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen. Both American guests have repeatedly admired in public the scale and pace of Russian privatization.

Meanwhile, the situation with Finance Minister Boris Fedorov has so far remained unresolved. It has transpired from those same government sources that he would not accept even the status of a deputy prime minister, if Aleksandr Zaveryukha is a government member in that same capacity and Viktor Gerashchenko remains Central Bank chairman. The much-publicized differences of these people's views on the goals and content of reform have rendered their cohabitation within one government virtually impossible.

Premier's Cabinet Concept Seen Diverging From Yeltsin's

MK1501120094 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Ivan Zasurskiy report under the "Government" rubric: "Boris Fedorov's Fate as an Indicator. The Goals of the Prime Minister and Those of the President Diverge Again"]

[Text] After Boris Yeltsin appointed Anatoliy Chubays deputy prime minister, bypassing a lengthy process of forming a government, the question of differences between the prime minister and the president has taken on a new intensity. Did the prime minister know about Anatoliy Chubays' appointment? If not, then the war of position inside the executive branch is becoming clearly threatening in nature: The president is betting everything, and this suggests that the old cabinet's volatile balance will remain in the new one. Apparently, soon we should expect Boris Fedorov's appointment. This, in turn, will mean the reemergence of characteristics of the old confrontation—the Finance Ministry against the Central Bank and the government against the parliament ("Russia's Choice" will not be able to take the budget commission under control).

The only thing one can state with assurance so far is that the prime minister's line toward forming a manageable and effective government will depend on his consultations with the president that are to follow Anatoliy Chubays' appointment and will be under way until Monday. The goals of the president and those of the prime minister have somewhat diverged. Chernomyrdin needs hard-working, not politicized, executives. Yeltsin, apparently, needs a steady reform course.

Boris Fedorov's fate will be a decisive indicator at this stage.

Fedorov Announces Conditions for Remaining in Government

LD1701205794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1956 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Boris Fedorov has put the following conditions to his joining the government as the minister of finance: Aleksandr Zaveryukha should not be the deputy prime minister and the president should not confirm Viktor Geraschenko as the head of the Central Bank.

In a brief interview to the journalists on Monday evening [17 January] in the lobbies of the State Duma B. Fedorov said that he had written a letter asking to join the membership of the Banking Subcommittee of the Plans and Budget Committee of the State Duma.

According to B. Fedorov he also made a decision to join the Union of December 12 group of deputies headed by the deputy premier of the Moscow government Aleksandr Braginsky.

Cancels Planned News Conference

LD1801092294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0851 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—Russian Finance Minister and Deputy Premier Boris Fedorov cancelled a scheduled press conference on Tuesday.

No reasons were provided, but the cancellation was evidently caused by the upcoming government reshuffling.

To Leave Government

LD1801123394 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] INTERFAX has reported that Boris Fedorov has declined the proposal by Viktor Chernomyrdin that he join the reorganized government of Russia as Minister of Finance. However, he has not offered to resign from any of the posts he occupies. Boris Fedorov is currently a Vice-Premier and Minister of Finance of Russia.

Reportedly Undecided

LD1601221794 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2020 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The first reaction to Gaydar's resignation is quite contradictory. In the opinion of Sergey Zverev, who represents the Most group, Russia's major financial association, Deputy Prime Minister Boris Fedorov is the key figure in the implementation of financial and economic reforms. If he were to follow Gaydar, the situation would be seriously affected.

Fedorov has not made up his mind yet about his resignation, though he does not rule out such a possibility. If Aleksandr Zaveryukha becomes deputy prime minister and I am offered just the post of minister, I will not join the Cabinet of Ministers, he told Interfax today. [passage omitted]

Does Not Rule Out Resignation

LD1701122494 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1138 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Boris Fedorov, Russian Vice Premier and Finance Minister, has not made up his mind about his resignation, but did not rule out this possibility.

In an exclusive interview he told Interfax Sunday that everything will depend on the government team, its crediting and financial policy and what the prime minister and president have to say to him.

He said that the distribution of top positions would largely dictate his decision.

He did not rule out the possibility that the announcement that there would be fewer vice premiers in the new governmental line up had been made so as to leave out Sergey Shakhray, Aleksandr Shokhin and himself.

"If there are one or two vice premiers, I will agree to be just a finance minister. If, however, there are four or five of them and Aleksandr Zaveryukha is one of them while I am to be only a finance minister, then I will not be a cabinet member because this would be an insult to me," Fedorov said.

He thinks that "a reduction of the number of like-minded people" among the vice premiers would indicate a policy change.

Fedorov said that he had had no prior knowledge of Gaydar's resignation but that he had not ruled out that possibility. In his words, he reacted "calmly" to the news of Gaydar's resignation.

"Gaydar was not in the government for months, yet it stayed on the reform course and I would not attribute all our achievements to his return," Fedorov emphasized.

He did not think that Gaydar's resignation would have a strong impact on the ruble's rate of exchange but admitted that it was not welcome news for the ruble.

"The ruble cannot collapse as long as I am the finance minister," the vice premier said.

He believes, however, that the ruble has been falling since December because of the rumors about the government set up and that it would be adversely affected by the merger of the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems, possible writing off of Ukraine's debt, and allocation of immense amounts for construction of a parliamentary building.

Commenting on the statements made by some Russia's Choice leaders about his resignation from all his cabinet posts Fedorov said that he had not endorsed them. He was dissatisfied about the way the parliamentary group is run. Fedorov emphasized that he was not formally a group member.

No meetings with the president or prime minister were scheduled for Monday, but he hoped that he would have a meeting with his superiors because the situation has drastically changed with Gaydar's resignation.

Fedorov intended to pose conditions for his stay on the government but declined to specify them.

He said he had scheduled a news conference for about 10:00 Tuesday and hoped that he would have something to say then.

Offered Finance Minister Role

LD1701184894 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1807 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Meeting Boris Fedorov Monday night, Russia's Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin offered him the post of finance minister "but not in the rank of deputy prime minister."

As Fedorov told journalists in the Duma, he was given one and a half to two hours to think the proposal over and announce the final decision on whether he would stay in the cabinet.

Fedorov's Future Pondered

PM1701113994 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 First Edition p 2

[Report by Irina Savvateyeva: "Boris Fedorov May Resign"]

[Text] It seems time for Boris Fedorov to make his next bet. In a recent interview, which the finance minister gave me, he joked:

"When I resign, I will make a bet.... No, first I will make a bet that the exchange rate will reach 2,000 [rubles to $1], and the next day I will announce that I am going...."

Many commentators today think that there is a very real possibility that Mr. Fedorov will resign. Everything depends on who will be named as vice premier by Viktor Chernomyrdin on Monday.

"It is very unlikely that Fedorov will stay if Zaveryukha is vice premier," according to, for instance, Sergey Vasilyev, leader of the Russian Government's Working Center for Economic Reforms.

The finance minister and Aleksandr Zaveryukha, representative of the agrarian lobby in the government, have been engaged in long and hard conflict, which is naturally based on the fact that the latter persistently demands money from the former while he equally persistently denies it to him. But virtually no one doubts that Mr. Zaveryukha will become a vice premier. While the chances of Fedorov himself becoming one of the four vice premiers are seen as minimal. So the prospect of the finance minister finding himself not on a par with his antagonist, and even in a subordinate position to him, are perfectly real. People who know Boris Grigoryevich well claim that he would certainly not accept that.

Does this mean that the end of financial stabilization is nigh?

The ruble exchange rate is already falling, and quite appreciably. Igor Doronin, expert at the Interbank Currency Exchange, considers that "this is a perfectly natural phenomenon. The minimium wage has almost doubled. Transport fares have doubled. Municipal services have gone up two- or threefold. Why shouldn't the exchange rate fall in such a situation?" His forecast is 1,800-1,900 rubles to the dollar within the next few weeks.

Fedorov's departure in this situation will certainly cause alarm among commercial structures, according to Igor Doronin. "The political situation, the top-level reshuffle, the strengthening of the position of the sectoral lobbyists in government—all this creates a background conducive to destabilization of the ruble," Doronin contends. In such a situation "no normal businessman will sell foreign currency." In the Interbank expert's opinion, even the current rate is being maintained thanks to massive currency intervention by the Central Bank.

If reshuffles do take place in the Finance Ministry, much will depend on who replaces Boris Fedorov: Will the next minister be sufficiently tough and independent? Petr Aven, president of the Alfa-Bank and former Russian minister of foreign economic relations, thinks that only one person is rightly able to claim the post—Yegor Gaydar. The prime minister's opinion on this score is known only to him for the time being. Two other names are cited: Sergey Dubinin and Andrey Vavilov—current deputy finance ministers. However, those candidates' chances are slim.

Social Protection Minister Submits Resignation

LD1601112594 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Jan 94

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Ella Pamfilova, Russian minister for social protection, is submitting her resignation together with Yegor Gaydar.

Now the president should have the final say whether he is going to accept the resignation of the father of the market reforms, or whether he is going to introduce corrections to Russia's economic policy regarding the positions unacceptable to Gaydar.

Gaydar Rejects Position of First Deputy Premier

LD1601101494 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] According to reports from Russian and western news agencies, Yegor Gaydar told a briefing in Moscow today that he has not accepted the offer of a job as first deputy head of government.

According to AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE, he showed journalists a letter addressed to the president asking to resign.

Yegor Gaydar explains that he is taking this action because he finds it difficult to accept responsibility for decisions has has not personally made. This refers to disagreements with other members of the government over implementation of the reforms.

Gives Reason for Rejecting Post

LD1601103194 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1007 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Velichko]

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jan—"I have decided to decline an offer from the chairman of the government, and am not taking the post of first deputy prime minister," Yegor Gaydar said today at a meeting with journalists.

He said the reason for his position is that decisions have recently been taken in the government "in a way in which I took no part and with which I categorically disagreed." Yegor Gaydar gave just two examples: the signing of an Interbank agreement uniting the monetary systems of Russia and Belarus, and also the government's decision to construct a new building for parliament (the provisional cost of which is nearly $500 million).

"I cannot simultaneously be in the government and also in the opposition. I cannot be responsible for the reforms without being able to avert actions like those that have been mentioned here and without having the necessary levers to consistently pursue an economic policy of whose correctness I am convinced," Yegor Gaydar said. "Therefore, I deeply regret that I am forced to decline the post of first deputy prime minister that has been offered me."

Aims to Work With Government

LD1601115294 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1055 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Oleg Velichko]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 16 Jan—"I am forced to decline an offer from the chairman of the Government, and I am not accepting the post of first vice premier." This was stated by Yegor Gaydar at a meeting with journalists today. He added that he cannot be in the government and in opposition to it at the same time. [passage omitted]

At the same time, Yegor Gaydar spoke out for continuing to work with the Government. Touching upon the question of personalities, the leader of the "Russia's Choice" also spoke out for joining Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's government [as received]. [Moscow ITAR-TASS in English at 1214 GMT on 16 January, in a similar item, renders this sentence as: "Gaydar came out for Grigoriy Yavlinskiy to join the government."]

The leader of the "Russia's Choice" told journalists that he spoke with Boris Yeltsin on 15 January before making his decision not to join the new Government.

Yegor Gaydar said that he intends to "concentrate his attention on work in the State Duma." He noted that in this connection "Russia's Choice" intends to do everything possible not to allow representatives of the Liberal Democratic Party to join the key committees of the lower chamber—that is the committees for defense, security, and international policy.

Explains Decisions

LD1601174394

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1500 GMT on 16 January 1993 broadcasts a telephone interview with Yegor Gaydar in which he is asked if his resignation could be considered final. Gaydar replies:

"I spoke about this to the prime minister. I spoke about this to the president. The decision has been made on this. So, it is final. Unfortunately, I am forced to decline the offer put to me to join the reorganized Russian Government.

"The essence of the reasons that led me to make that decision is very simple: When they begin to adopt on a broad scale decisions on most fundamental issues that I disagree with, it is difficult for me to continue to do any useful work.

"For instance, I was categorically against the decision to build the new parliamentary center. That is no small question. As far as the budgetary applications—which I know were presented to the Finance Ministry—are concerned, we are talking about sums roughly equal to four times the amount spent on financing culture and art. I do not agree with this decision. I am against it categorically. Moreover, I do not understand how, in adopting such a decision, one can at the same time justify taking a tough economic line, for instance, on allocations for ecological needs. For instance, the sums that we need for resolving a most acute problem—the dumping of liquid radioactive waste into the world ocean—is 10 times less than those that it is proposed to allocate to these needs. If one has to understand and agree with such a policy or line, I do not understand that, nor do I agree with that. Then, at least, I cannot bear responsibility for it. I cannot implement it.

"That also is true of other decisions by the government, including on the question of expanding the ruble zone. I consider this question to be of extreme importance. That gradual consolidation of control over the money in circulation within the framework of the ruble zone was one of the pivots of our policy. Namely progress in resolving this task guaranteed the relative stability of the ruble exchange rate, the convertibility of our national currency. I consider it wrong to introduce once again chaos into money in circulation, without clearly regulating all the most complex technical questions of the operation of a single monetary system, to put at risk the already not very high level of our people's well- being for the sake of current political affairs. These are the reasons why I made my decision."

Sends Letter to Yeltsin

LD1601162294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] At the request of our subscribers we present Yegor Gaydar's letter to President Boris Yeltsin in full:

"Dear Boris Nikolayevich,

"Over two years ago you displayed enormous confidence in me and my colleagues by entrusting us with carrying out radical economic reforms under your guidance. Working as Russia's deputy premier, first deputy premier and then acting premier, I tried to do my best to enable Russia's economy to stand on its feet as soon as possible, to make it possible for the painful period of transition to be overcome promptly. Thanks to the courage and patience of our compatriots, thanks to your resolve and consistency, we managed to not only avoid social and economic cataclysms that are shaking many former Soviet republics, but even pave the way for the future revival of our country.

"The conditions of our work in the government have never been ideal. You are well aware of the fact that we failed to accomplish much as a result of unceasing pressure on the part of the conservative political circles, not because of objective circumstances. Last September, when agreeing to rejoin the government, I realized that, while being responsible for economic reforms in the eyes of society, I will have only limited levers of influence on the economic situation. Nevertheless I hoped that the realization of our common responsibility for the country will make it possible for the government, even if it consisted of people of differing outlooks, to rally behind the president and follow a policy aimed at stabilizing the economy and preventing a catastrophe.

Unfortunately, more and more decisions, in preparing which I took no part, and even categorically objected to, have been taken of late. I'll make only two examples.

An inter-bank agreement on the unification of monetary systems has been signed between Russia and Belarus. Such unification is possible only if it is carefully prepared and if a mechanism of control protecting Russia's interests is created. However, the measures envisaged in the agreement will only reproduce chaos in the monetary sphere at the expense of Russian citizens' real incomes. The implementation of this decision will lead to a situation whereby the minimal salary and pension in Belarus will exceed the minimal salary and pension in Russia. We are not rich enough to sacrifice the welfare of the Russian citizens to political considerations. I objected to this decision, but my protests fell on deaf ears.

Neither is it possible to support the decision to build a new parliament center costing about $500 Mn. This sum far exceeds the resources allocated with great difficulty in 1993 for military conversion and is five time greater than the federal spending on culture and art. This sum equals one fifth of last year's social spending. This destructive decisions was taken without my knowledge and despite my resolute objections. Given this, it will be difficult for me to justify the rigid policy of curtailing expenses on science, culture, education and environmental protection. True, vitally important reforms involve inevitable outlays, but they have nothing to do with the price of thoughtless and hasty decisions.

Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich,

I cannot stay in the government and at once oppose it. Neither can I be responsible for reforms without having an opportunity to prevent actions similar to the ones I have mentioned or levers for implementing an economic policy which I am sure is correct.

Therefore, to my great regret, I have to turn down the post of the Russian government's first vice chairman offered to me. I assure you, however, that I will firmly support You and Your policy of reforms.

Announces Resignation to Journalists

LD1601210094 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1900 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By Sergey Shatunov, including recorded excerpts of resignation announcement by First Deputy Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar to journalists in Moscow today; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Shatunov] [passage omitted] It was precisely the wish to concentrate fully on parliamentary work and dissatisfaction with recent government decisions and the way the council of ministers was functioning in general that prompted Yegor Gaydar to make a sensational announcement today.

[Gaydar] The government has of late and with increasing frequency been adopting decisions with which I was either not acquainted or against which I categorically objected. I shall cite just two typical examples—I could cite more.

[Shatunov] The first was the decision to expand the ruble zone and have a joint monetary system with the Republic of Belarus. The second, the decision to build a new parliamentary center in the center of the capital.

[Gaydar] Accordingly, I have decided to decline the offer made to me and not accept the post of first deputy chairman of the government in its reorganized form.

I know that Social Welfare Minister Ella Aleksandrovna Pamfilova has said that in this situation she cannot accept responsibility for the social policy being implemented, just as I cannot answer for the economic policy being implemented.

Today we discussed the issue at the board of our parliamentary faction. The board backed our decision and expressed its readiness for constructive dialogue and cooperation with the government. We are ready to support the government in all its constructive initiatives and endeavors. We shall continue to support the reform policy pursued by the president, but at the same time we must make clear our position regarding decisions, the political decisions, which we cannot support or adopt.

Comments on Lack of Influence

LD1601204794 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1958 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 16 January—Yegor Gaydar confirmed today that the main reason for his resignation was "the lack of levers of influence." In an interview for the "Itogi" television program he stressed: "One should either do one's job or admit that you are unable to do it." Nonetheless, neither Yegor Gaydar nor the Russia's Choice bloc, which he heads, intend to join the opposition, believing it "possible to support constructive dialogue with the government." Explaining his decision to

leave the cabinet, Yegor Gaydar said: "This will stimulate the government to focus more on adopting responsible decisions and will force it to tackle the need to curb inflation, because now this is the responsibility of the government and Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin, and not of Gaydar."

The view of Grigoriy Yavlinskiy was heard on the same television program. He said that Gaydar's departure from the government was political rather than economic. "In September Yegor Timurovich was invited in as a decorative figure to adorn the government for a period of very difficult change. Now that the main political gestures have been made, the decor can be changed."

Further Gaydar Comments

LD1601235594 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 2224 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Excerpt] Moscow, 16 Jan—"I am still on the side of the president and I will be supporting the president", Yegor Gaydar told Sunday's information-analytical program "Itogi". Today's resignation of the first vice premier with whose name, as "Itogi" noted, "people in the country and in the world associate the very meaning of economic reforms in Russia", was the main theme of the program.

"I fully understand the responsibility of this decision", Gaydar said. But, as he put it, "it is impossible to work or do what one has to do without having the necessary levers. In that case, one is not doing any real work but just going through the motions". "I believe that we have managed to do certain things in the past four months despite real difficulties which existed, he noted. Many decisions which we proposed have been implemented.

But at some stage, when decisions that you put forward are not accepted, while decisions which you regard as dangerous and to which you resolutely object are adopted by the government, then your continued membership in the government becomes something apparently connected with the fact that you like staying in your post. And this, at least as far as I personally am concerned, is not so."

Gaydar intends to become the leader of Russia's Choice faction in the State Duma. "I am going to concentrate on the work aimed at creating political structures that have to solve two key tasks: first, to prevent Russia from being drawn into another military escapade, and second, to avert social cataclysms and a new redistribution of property." In his words, Russia's Choice faction in the State Duma is going to continue "constructive dialogue with the government, we are going to support all its useful initiatives, we are not retreating into opposition to the government, it is just that we are clearly defining the range of responsibility, the range of decisions within which we are prepared to cooperate and share the burden responsibility."

"I fear a new wave of enthusiasm in connection with decisions on spending, a sharp increase in the amount of money in circulation caused by this, aggravating budgetary problems, a fall in the [exchange] rate [of the ruble] accelerating rate of inflation, attempts to beat it using administrative measures, recreation of certain attributes of a shortage-ridden economy, the undermining of the effectiveness of all market mechanisms. This threat is there, it is real, and one has to reckon with it," Gaydar warns in connection with the situation in the government.

"It was the wish to concentrate fully on work in parliament and dissatisfaction with the latest decisions of the government and with work in the government as a whole that today forced Gaydar to make his sensational statement," "Ostankino" Channel One's "Voskreseniye" program remarked.

Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, who is spoken of as a possible candidate to the post of first vice prime minister of the government, but who, in his own words, has not received such an offer, gave his assessment of what has happened in an interview to "Itogi": "In September Gaydar was invited as a figurehead to adorn the government for a period of very complex changes. Now the main political gestures have been made, the decoration can be changed." He assessed its prospects thus: "It will be a conventional Soviet government."

"Itogi" presenter Yevgeniy Kiselev pointed out that a high- ranking member of the presidential administration who had asked not to be named, had remarked in an interview to "Itogi" that Gaydar's statement on his resignation very much resembled an ultimatum. [passage omitted]

Grants Interview

LD1701195894 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1725 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Studio interview with Yegor Timurovich Gaydar by Sergey Dorenko; from the "Details" program—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Dorenko] [passage omitted] Yegor Timurovich, hello. This afternoon did you see the prime minister?

[Gaydar] No, I did not see the prime minister today.

[Dorenko] You did not have any telephone conversations with either the president or the prime minister—no contacts?

[Gaydar] No. Today I did not speak either with the prime minister or the president, and there is nothing surprising in this because after all the matter had been decided earlier. Indeed, on Sunday the fact of my resignation, my statement on my resignation was just made public but I had already had a talk with the president on Thursday, and overall the main question was decided then.

[Dorenko] Did the premier and president try to dissuade you from resigning?

[Gaydar] No, the president regarded my position with understanding.

[Dorenko] Naturally, and Kozyrev's visit?

[Gaydar] Andrey is an innate diplomat; he always tries his utmost to find a point of contact. [passage omitted]

[Dorenko] Will the communists be able to force Chernomyrdin to change his policy, do you think he might perhaps willingly do that himself?

[Gaydar] I do not think the communists will manage to force Chernomyrdin to change his policy, and I do not think Viktor Stepanovich will himself want to radically change course. It is another matter that politics consists of pretty difficult decisions that are being taken every day.

[Dorenko] But he is already under pressure, pressure from the communists in the Duma. And if we were to talk of a coalition government, then there would be the Party of Russian Unity and Accord—Shokhin—and many from Russia's Choice and Zaveryukha from the Communists and the Agrarians. If you are going now, and Zyuganov is not satisfied with the policy of Chernomyrdin and the remaining Russia's Choice people, he may find himself under double pressure from Russia's Choice and the Communists, may he not?

[Gaydar] In the first place, in realistic terms, following the adoption of the new constitution, the government's independence is substantially greater than it was in 1992-93. Therefore, I would say that today it is not a matter of political pressure from one or another group, but rather of pressure of circumstances, pressure from branches of industry, from major complexes and enterprises, which of course would not want to part with their subsidies, would not want to restructure production, would of course want their problems to be resolved through new inflationary taxes, at the taxpayer's expense.

[Dorenko] How soon do you reckon your party comrades in Russia's Choice will quit the government, or how soon will they be forced out?

[Gaydar] Well, that is a hypothetical question, almost a conjectural one. I reckon that in many aspects, where the policy being conducted by the government merits support, our colleagues can and must work. I would mention here international affairs, and in general the privatization policy which one would wish to sustain.

[Dorenko] Is that because they are approved by and directly supervised by the presidential staff, or because ...-

[Gaydar, interrupting] I would even say that it is not the presidential staff but simply the president. In Russia it was traditional for international affairs to be outside the competence of the Cabinet of Ministers, however this was composed, and this has been the case recently, too. This is primarily the president's sphere, and he determines things.

[Dorenko] So Russia's foreign policy will, to judge from all indications, remain as before, and the minister of foreign relations, the minister of foreign affairs, will stay. [passage omitted]

Boris Fedorov, it is reported, was today offered the post only of minister of finance and not vice premier, that is, he may not replace you in your post. At the same time he evidently put forward some requirements, and the Council of Ministers session has been put off to tomorrow. What do you think, what are the requirements in which your party comrade will stay?

[Gaydar] I think they will be quite simple and impersonal: sufficient control of monetary and credit policy if everyone believes anyway that he is responsible for it.

[Dorenko] Organizationally speaking, does that mean control of Gosbank?

[Gaydar] As to organization, it primarily means effective interaction with the Central Bank.

[Dorenko] To what extent is Chernomyrdin ready to support Fedorov today?

[Gaydar] That is a question for Viktor Stepanovich.

[Dorenko] You know the atmosphere in the government. Who is closer to Chernomyrdin, Gerashchenko or Fedorov with his demands as regards economic policy?

[Gaydar] Viktor Stepanovich would, I think, like to keep both.

[Dorenko] Both. And both directions of policy.

[Gaydar] And both directions of policy.

[Dorenko] Is that in order to set them against each other or ...

[Gaydar, interrupting] Simply because to a certain extent this is in keeping with his approach to the conduct of economic policy.

[Dorenko] The leak of information which we have that Skokov may be made vice premier; is it likely?

[Gaydar] I would not rule out such a possibility, although it seems to me unlikely.

[Dorenko] I see. To all appearances there is another option for the development of events in which there remains just Oleg Soskovets as vice premier. In that case the whole scheme of the government changes, and would that, in your view, resolve the crisis?

[Gaydar] You see, the economic crisis cannot be resolved by a redistribution of portfolios. It is being

resolved by change or continuation of policy. Concentration of attention on redistribution of portfolios greatly personalizes what is happening. In my view it is much more important how many and what kind of expenditure decisions are made by the government in the course of the next two weeks than the question of who is in what office.

[Dorenko] I also wanted to ask a question about your party. Now you are heading the faction in the Duma and your first deputy Gennadiy Burbulis has already twice—or at least once—declared this and twice tried to organize a presidential party. Will you attempt to set up a party or structure your faction in an attempt to create a presidential party?

[Gaydar] In the first place, the development of events, including the development of events as manifested in the elections on 12 December, fully and obviously indicate the need for the establishment of an effective structure supporting democracy and reforms in Russia.

That is obvious. How is this task to be embarked on? How is it to be done? How is it to be made nonsectarian? That still has to be tackled and ways have to be found of doing it.

[Dorenko] And you will head this government?

[Gaydar] You know, this is again much less a question of personality than of content. This organization, largely from an historical point of view, now has two tasks: To prevent military ventures which we are now being nudged towards, and to prevent a fresh division of property with its accompanying huge social cataclysms. The movement, the party, the public force which makes this its tasks merits, in my view, the most serious support.

[Dorenko] Thank you, Yegor Timurovich.

Comments on Parliamentary Role

PM1801110994 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 94 p 1

[Olga Kuchkina report: "Will There Be a Third Coming of Gaydar?"]

[Text] Sunday. The "White House" is deserted. There is a small number of people in the Blue Room, where Gaydar's letter has been disseminated and where he is giving a short news conference.

"When I accepted the offer of the president and the premier to resume my work in the government in September 1993, it was clear to me that, while being responsible, of course, for everything happening in the economy and with the economic reform, I would have only a limited range of tools for influencing the shaping of current policy. Nevertheless, mindful of the tense situation, I remained convinced that the government would be able to rally around the president and nonetheless pursue a sufficiently responsible policy of stabilizing the situation in the economy...."

In his opinion, some things have been done: The rate of inflation fell sharply from 26 percent in August to 13 percent in December; the economy has been opened up; a whole package of documents has been adopted to ensure the start of reforms in the housing sphere; on the whole, a certain movement toward general economic stabilization has been begun. At the same time, with increasing frequency decisions have been made in the government with which either the first vice premier was not familiar or objected to them categorically. Deeming it not possible under these conditions to be responsible for other people's decisions, Yegor Gaydar is leaving the government. Ella Pamfilova is leaving too.

I put several questions to Gaydar:

"Have you weighed the consequences of your step insofar as your places and positions may be taken by directly opposite figures and directly opposite positions?"

"Yes, of course. Naturally, we hope that the government's course will still not be radically changed. But there is a rigid logic of life here. It makes sense to hold some position for as long as you can operate from this position. Or at least block actions with which you disagree. Otherwise you simply make common cause with decisions you consider harmful and irresponsible."

Earlier Gaydar had cited two examples. The decision on a joint monetary system with Belarus, which is possible in principle if it is clearly formulated and if control systems are defined. In fact the ill-conceived version of the signed bank agreement will reproduce chaos in the monetary sphere and unlimited subsidizing of Belarus at the expense of Russian citizens—something that we were getting away from with tremendous difficulty during 1992. The second was the decision to construct the Parliamentary Center at a cost of $500 million, which Gaydar calls immoral.

The former vice premier was slow to answer my question as to whether Gaydar had already met with the president and what Yeltsin's emotional reaction was, but the expression on his face caused the assembled people to laugh in concert. Gaydar hastened to remark that the president understands the situation perfectly and that they had spoken calmly.

"Are you shifting the center of your work to the parliament?" I asked.

Gaydar replied in the affirmative. In all cases, he remarked, we will struggle to ensure that the key committees—defense, security, and international policy—do not pass into the hands of our opponents; here we adhere to firm ultimatum-like positions, and our civilized, considered policy will be aimed at keeping out of power adventurists capable of drawing the country into war.

"Are you thinking of working with society and winning it over more intelligently than you have done before?"

"Yes, we will endeavor to work by rectifying all our serious mistakes which were undoubtedly made."

Asked when he felt himself to be the leader of the democratic movement, Gaydar replied that he still does not feel himself to be this, although maybe this happened on the night of 3-4 October, unexpectedly, which was a rather unpleasant surprise.

In the end I asked:

"What mood are you in? Do you regard what has happened in terms of a 'defeat' or in some other terms?"

"I would say this: We have lost a battle, but I certainly do not believe that we have lost the war. Moreover, we are simply obliged to win it. Our departure marks not the end but the continuation of the struggle. The logic of 'the worse, the better' is categorically unaccaptable to us."

One way or another, we have gotten a new political quality, whose further development is hard to predict today.

Kostikov Hopes Resignation Will Be Refused

LD1601163694 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Yegor Gaydar's possible resignation from the post of first vice premier "would seriously weaken the president's reformatory flank", the president's Press Secretary Vyacheslav Kostikov told Interfax special correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov in an exclusive interview on Sunday [16 January].

Kostikov expressed hope that Boris Yeltsin would not accept Gaydar's resignation while the reasons for Gaydar's decisions "were not strategic" and that a compromise was possible.

Yeltsin Accepts Gaydar's Resignation

LD1701131394 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1304 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin accepted the resignation of the architect of Russian reform, First Deputy Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar on Monday and assured that reforms in the country will continue.

"Giving tribute to the competence, courage and the contribution which Yegor Gaydar made into the course of economic reform, I understand the arguments and motives which made him offer to resign", Yeltsin said in a statement received by TASS.

"Accepting this resignation I would like to stress the irreversibility of the course of reform aimed at a deep and democratic transformation of the Russian society, its economy and political institutions. The policy of reform will continue proceeding from democratic principles which are the basis of the new Russian Constitution and with account, first and foremost, of the national and strategic Russian interests", the president said.

"I express conviction that while working in the State Duma Yegor Gaydar will proceed from the supreme interests of serving Russia like he did in his previous activities", according to the statement distributed by presidential spokesman Vyacheslav Kostikov.

This is the second time that Gaydar has to abandon his post in the government. In December 1992 Yeltsin replaced him with Viktor Chernomyrdin after a severe conflict with the parliament on the course of reform.

Gaydar returned to the government as first deputy premier in the middle of September 1993.

After December 12 parliamentary elections Yeltsin said at a press conference that Gaydar will remain in the government and reforms will continue.

Yeltsin, Chernomyrdin 'Sympathetic'

LD1601165094 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] On Sunday [16 January] Russia's First Deputy Premier Yegor Gaydar, who leads the Russian Choice bloc, announced his decision to reject the post of first deputy premier in the reorganized government.

According to him, he notified President Yeltsin and Premier Chernomyrdin accordingly. Their attitude to his decision was "sympathetic". "I discussed it with the president, and he understands the situation perfectly."

When Chernomyrdin asked him about his attitude to the possibility of giving this job to the prominent economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, Gaydar said that he "would warmly welcome his candidacy".

The Finance Minister, Boris Fedorov, "will take his own decision in the next few days", Gaydar said (Interfax's note: evidently he meant Fedorov's joining Russia's reorganized government).

"We discussed this situation in detail with Chubays and decided that it would be expedient to continue his work in the government, at least till the time, when the privatisation program to be concluded before July 1st, 1994, is implemented," said Gaydar.

"We hope that the government's policy will not be drastically altered after all," Gaydar noted.

According to Gaydar, the Social Security Minister, Ella Pamfilova, has said that "under the circumstances she cannot assume responsibility for the social policy, since she cannot be responsible for the economic policy".

As Gaydar said, the Russian Choice faction in the State Duma supported Gaydar's decision and "expressed its readiness for a constructive dialogue and cooperation with the government".

Gaydar believes that "the presence of our colleagues in the government is sensible and prudent in a number of directions, particularly in all that is connected with international politics and privatization".

"At the same time we must grant government members the opportunity to consider everything once again and decide to what extent they are capable of following the policy they and ourselves view as responsible, and take a decision concerning our participation in the new government proceeding from this," Gaydar said.

According to Gaydar, he has no claims on the post of chairman of the State Duma's planning and budget commission, and the Russian Choice faction will support the Yavlinskiy bloc's candidacy for it.

Chernomyrdin Not Surprised

LD1601130694 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1215 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Oleg Velichko]

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jan—"Yegor Gaydar's refusal to enter the new government was not unexpected for Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin," Valentin Sergeyev, chief of the Russian Government's press service, said in an ITAR-TASS interview. The first deputy prime minister's decision was already suggested by the mere fact that he was elected leader of the Russia's Choice parliamentary faction, he added.

Touching upon accusations by some democratic parties that the government will be cut at the expense of its reform wing, Valentin Sergeyev stressed: "The government, headed by Viktor Chernomyrdin, was, is, and will continue to be a government of reform."

Fedorov Understands Gaydar's Decision

LD1601135794 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1330 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Everyone has been waiting to hear what Russian Finance Minister Boris Fedorov has to say in response to Yegor Gaydar's announcement that he is quitting—or rather that he is not accepting—the job of first deputy prime minister.

Boris Fedorov said today in an interview with the Ekho Moskvy radio station that he looks upon Yegor Gaydar's decision with understanding. Fedorov called this move the beginning of a turning point.

As far as he himself is concerned, in the finance minister's words, he has not yet received an offer to enter the new government. If he does receive one, Fedorov remarked, he will reach his decision this Monday or Tuesday.

'Complete Surprise' to Fedorov

LD1601164494 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Russia's Finance Minister, Boris Fedorov, told Interfax on Sunday [16 January] that Yegor Gaydar's statement that he will not join the reorganized government was a "complete surprise" to him.

Fedorov himself declined to give any information concerning his own plans.

It's not clear whether Fedorov will join the number of the new deputy premiers or remain as finance minister.

In the meantime Interfax learned from Russia's prominent banking circles that for them Fedorov symbolizes reforms in Russia, and that his withdrawal from the highest government echelons may come to be viewed as a symptom of the possibility that the direction of economic reforms in Russia might change.

Fedorov on 'Beginning of Changes'

LD1701085394 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0803 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—Russia's Finance Minister Boris Fedorov said he understood First Vice-Premier Yegor Gaydar's decision to resign from the government, announced on Sunday [16 January]. The government's last decisions indicate the "beginning of changes", Fedorov pointed out in an interview with the "Echo of Moscow" radio station.

"I did not have any advance notice of Yegor Gaydar's intention", Fedorov said.

He said he had not yet got an invitation to join the reshuffled government. If such a proposal is made, he will make a decision on Monday or Thursday, Fedorov added.

Other Officials View Resignation of Gaydar

Shokhin Comments

LD1601195194 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1900 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Excerpt] Yegor Gaydar's statement on his resignation is either an emotional step or a tactical manuever. At any rate, the reasons he gave are clearly not enough to resign over. This is what Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin said today in an interview with Interfax. He did not rule out the possibility of it simply being an attempt to achieve a pro-Gaydar government cabinet. [passage omitted]

Shakhray Views Resignation

LD1701205594 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1956 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Russian Vice Prime Minister, leader of the PRUC [Party of Russian Unity and Concord] faction in the State Duma Sergey Shakhray told INTERFAX tonight that emotionally he regarded negatively Yegor Gaydar's resignation as first vice prime minister. Shakhray said he was amazed at the intentions to reorganize the government without Gaydar. He said "there were more question marks and minuses than pluses." At the same time, he said he had met neither with Gaydar nor with Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin on the issue. "It is necessary to weigh all the factors before making a close analysis of the new composition of the government," he said.

Prior to this, Shakhray told journalists he was not prepared to tell who might replace Gaydar as he did not know more of the situation than the journalists themselves. He supposed that Gaydar's resignation will almost certainly lead to granting new credits and another drop of the ruble. In his opinion, the government's policy will be the most likely to be adjusted to meet the needs of the industrialists.

Asked about the government's intention to allocate $500 million for the construction of a parliamentary center in Moscow, Shakhray pointed out that "this money would be useful for the economy." At the same time, the vice prime minister noted that achieving the same goal will cost much higher in a year.

Commenting on the election of deputy speakers and heads of parliamentary committees by a single list, Shakhray said that on the whole the State Duma gained from using this approach. "Had we nominated heads of parliamentary committees person by person, the political spectrum would have been more uniform, and the factor of professional qualification for the post would not have been always taken into account," he pointed out. At the same time, he said deputies elected from single-mandate constituencies lost from the voting for the list. Only PRUC and the deputies' group "New Policy" stood up for their interests. "However, we were in minority and could not influence the situation," he pointed out.

Government Officials React

LD1601143694

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 1307 GMT on 16 January broadcasts a 5-minute report by station political observer Valeriy Kiosa who reports on reaction in the Russian Government to the resignation by First Deputy Premier Yegor Gaydar.

Kiosa says he has just spoken to Valentin Sergeyev, head of the press service of the Russian Government. Kiosa continues:

"In reply to my question about the premier's reaction to Gaydar's statement, Sergeyev said that Chernomyrdin's reaction was calm. The premier talked with Gaydar about the possibility of combining the functions of leader of the Russia's Choice faction and that of first deputy premier. As a result of that calm and businesslike conversation, a decision was made to think things over and to find a solution. Gaydar announced his decision today.

"In reply to my question as to whether Yegor Gaydar had made his decision under pressure from the premier, Sergeyev categorically denied such a possiblity. He stressed, moreover, that Gaydar's coming—or rather his second coming—into the government occurred on the initiative of the premier himself, and all their relations were businesslike and working relations.

"Valentin Sergeyev said that the final composition of the Government will be announced at the beginning of next week. I think that Tuesday is the most likely day for this."

Kiosa recaps that there has been much talk over the past few days that if Fedorov and Gaydar leave the Government this will mark an end to reforms in Russia. Kiosa continues:

"According to Sergeyev, the Government will continue to be directed toward the reforms, in keeping with the program which has been approved."

He adds: "As far as the question of Fedorov is concerned, Sergeyev stressed he did not have any information on that yet. However, I would draw the conclusion that candidacies for this post held by Yegor Gaydar will be examined now, and are probably being examined already.

"In reply to your question, of course, a lot depends on whether Fedorov remains, that is the first thing, and on who will take Gaydar's place. Incidentally, it is probably worth drawing attention to Gaydar's words on his wish that Grigoriy Yavlinskiy should take part in the government."

The announcer asks Kiosa if he thinks Yavlinskiy will be offered the post of first deputy premier, to which Kiosa replies:

"It is really hard to believe that now, although the most unexpected things may happen."

Kiosa wonders why the financial issues raised by Gaydar as motives for his resignation were not discussed in the Government with him. "I think that Gaydar's resignation may have a serious effect on the alignment of forces, both in the Government and on the whole in the higher echelons of power," Kiosa says.

Gaydar's resignation may have been undesirable for the head of the Russian Government, the announcer surmises. Sergeyev may just have been putting on a diplomatic act when he spoke to Kiosa, she concludes.

Ambartsumov on Resignation

LD1601163894 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, a State Duma deputy representing the Yavlinskiy bloc and ex-chairman of the former parliament's Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Relations, told Interfax that he understood and to some extent shared Yegor Gaydar's reaction.

Ambartsumov said that spending on the construction of a parliamentary center was absolutely impossible because it would put a heavy burden on the tax-payers.

Ambartsumov noted at the same time, that Gaydar's decision pointed to growing rifts in the democratic camp, which weakened its positions and gave more freedom to Prime Minister Chernomyrdin.

In such a situation the president will have to increase his role of a judge standing above various political groupings, he said. He also noted that the idea of establishing a presidential party had no prospects for the moment. Plans to create such a party were announced by the president some time ago.

Sergeyev Comments

LD1601164294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] In answer to Interfax's question concerning Prime Minister Chernomyrdin's reaction to Gaydar's decision, the leader of the government's press service, Valentin Sergeyev, said that it was "calm". According to him, the first deputy premier's decision not to join the reorganized government was not unexpected.

"Evidently it's extremely hard, and maybe politically illogical, to be the leader of a parliamentary faction and serve as first deputy prime minister at the same time," Sergeyev said. "The issue of whether Gaydar should be the leader of parliamentary faction or first deputy premier has been raised more than once, and now Gaydar made his choice."

Chernomyrdin did nothing to nudge Gaydar toward taking this decision, Sergeyev stressed, because Gaydar was appointed first deputy premier several months ago at Chernomyrdin's initiative.

As Sergeyev said, Gaydar's leaving the government will not alter the policy of reforms pursued by the Cabinet led by Chernomyrdin.

"The government has been, and will be, reformist. The course of reforms underlies the government's program for 1994- 1995 approved by President Yeltsin," he said.

In answer to Interfax's question as to who may replace Gaydar in the government, Sergeyev said with reference to Viktor Chernomyrdin that "this complicated question will be resolved by the president together with the government's leadership".

Poltoranin Assesses Resignations

LD1701165194 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Mikhail Poltoranin, a member of the Russia's Choice parliamentary faction, told INTERFAX on Monday [17 January] that Viktor Chernomyrdin expected Yegor Gaydar to reject the post of first deputy premier, and "probably did all he could to make this happen."

Poltoranin disagreed with the notion that Russia's Choice used Gaydar's and Pamfilova's resignations to distance itself from the president. "We do not want it, and we hope that the president will not deviate from democratic principles. Then we will be with him," he said.

Poltoranin qualified Gaydar's and Pamfilova's resignations as "a logical step stemming from the policy pursued by the Chernomyrdin group in the government."

"It was a well-considered, not an impulsive, step, since the outlooks of Chernomyrdin and Gaydar differ greatly. Gaydar and the entire group of reformers have no right to serve as a cover for the degradation of the economy and management system. Gaydar's withdrawal is bad for Russia, but there is no other way out," Poltoranin stressed.

Russia's Choice, he added, analyzed the situation earlier, and suggested a month before December's elections that Gaydar should resign and distance himself from the government "to stop being in the shadow of errors the government committed in 1993."

"At that time this decision was not endorsed, since we did not want to introduce an element of destabilization in society and lose the new Constitution, because many people could decide not to vote because of it," Poltoranin said. "Today this factor no longer exists, and so we can make decisions more openly."

Baburin Comments

LD1701164994 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Yegor Gaydar's refusal to accept the post of first deputy premier is "a step in his game against the government," said a member of the State Duma, Sergey Baburin, who leads the Russian People's Union. According to him, in the present circumstances "Viktor Chernomyrdin will have to justify himself and defend what Gaydar did over the past two years."

In Baburin's opinion, expressed in an interview with Interfax on Monday, Gaydar's step was prompted by Russia's Choice in view of the 1996 presidential elections, "in order to distance themselves from the current

economic situation, lay all the blame on Chernomyrdin and his technocrats, and force the entire opposition to start defending Russia's government in connection with Russia's Choice's attack on it."

Leading Politicians, Officials Comment

PM1701195194 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 18 Jan 94 p 1

[Unattributed roundup of comments on Gaydar's resignation, followed by excerpt "'From the Draft Declaration on the Social Policy of the Government of Economic Reforms' prepared by the Ministry of Social Protection of the Population," carried under the general heading "Reorganization of Cabinet of Ministers Ended in Sunday's Sudden Government Crisis. Its Essence: Will the Character of the Reforms Be Preserved Given the Change of Cast?"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] **Boris Fedorov: The Executive's Recent Decisions Herald the Start of a Change of Direction**

I understand Yegor Gaydar's decision to turn down the post of first vice premier of the government. The executive's recent decisions do indeed herald the "beginning of a change of direction."

I "had no advance information" about Yegor Gaydar's decision. I have not yet personally been invited to join the new government.

Valentin Sergeyev: Gaydar's Decision to Refuse To Join the New Government Was Not Unexpected

"Yegor Gaydar's decision to refuse to join the new government was not unexpected for Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin," Valentin Sergeyev, leader of the Russian Federation Government's press service, stated. The first vice premier's decision, he added, was also inevitable if only because he has been elected leader of the "Russia's Choice" parliamentary faction.

Concerning the charges of some democratic parties that reduction of the government corps is being carried out at the expense of the reformist wing, Valentin Sergeyev stressed: "The government headed by Viktor Chernomyrdin was, is, and will be reformist."

Grigoriy Yavlinskiy: Gaydar's Reappearance in Government Was Rather a Token Gesture

Yegor Gaydar has been unable to pursue his line in the government for quite some time now.

Gaydar really did have disagreements with a number of government members, but he could only try to defend his positions, since he was deprived of the opportunity to make any decisions. In effect the situation developed without Gaydar's influence. Gaydar's reappearance in the government last September itself was rather a token gesture. Now the need for the gesture has faded. That is why Gaydar is quitting.

Aleksandr Shokhin: Reasons Cited Clearly Insufficient for Resignation

Yegor Gaydar's resignation statement is "either an emotional step, or a tactical maneuver. At any rate, the reasons cited by Yegor Gaydar are clearly insufficient for resignation." It cannot be ruled out that this could be just "an attempt to bring about the formation of a pro-Gaydar government cabinet." If Gaydar was really concerned by the problem of uniting the monetary systems of Russia and Belarus, he should have concentrated on working on this problem. In fact he did not do so. As for the question of building a parliamentary center in Moscow, this question should be settled with the president, not the prime minister.

Vyacheslav Kostikov: A Compromise Is Still Possible

The possible departure of Yegor Gaydar from the post of first vice premier "would seriously denude the Russian president's reformist wing." A statement to this effect was made on Sunday by the president's press secretary, Vladimir Kostikov. He expressed the hope that Boris Yeltsin would not accept the resignation and that the factors which caused Yegor Gaydar to take this step will be removed. In the press secretary's opinion, the arguments with which Yegor Gaydar supports his decision to resign are "a considerable weight." At the same time Vyacheslav Kostikov stressed that the reasons which prompted Yegor Gaydar to resign "do not bear a globally strategic character which would make compromise impossible."

Ella Pamfilova: I Worked While Hope Remained

I have decided not to except an offer to join the reorganized government. The point is that I cannot work in a situation where I have to answer for the consequences of decisions which are made by others. I worked while hope remained that I could change something. But now I am finally convinced that nothing depends on me. I am sad to observe that the package of documents on social questions which was prepared by our ministry was simply buried in the government apparatus. Further efforts on our part would be simply senseless.

From the Draft Declaration "On the Social Policy of the Government of Economic Reforms" Prepared by the Ministry of Social Protection of the Population

B. Monetary Income of the Population

1. Social and legal recognition of income from entrepreneurial activity and from property.

2. The inadmissibility of any direct state-imposed ceiling on income earned, except for the use of the system of progressive taxation.

3. The establishment by the state of a centrally established minimum wage in all sectors of the economy and transition to determining tariff rates and salary scales for employees by means of contracts between the state, employers, and hired labor organizations.

4. Obligatory state insurance for the working population, including insurance against unemployment.

5. Bringing the minimum work wage and the minimum pension up to the subsistence minimum (as the economic situation improves).

6. The protection of citizens on fixed incomes from inflation.

7. The preservation of savings in state banks and the indexation of these savings in conditions of inflation.

Kuzbass Governor Comments

LD1801092494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0715 GMT 18 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo January 18 TASS—"Gaydar's resignation from the government is expected to indefinitely halt the solution of the most difficult problems of Russia's fuel and energy complex," said Mikhail Kislyuk, governor of Kuzbass, at a meeting with journalists.

In his opinion, during a visit to coal regions of the country at the end of last year Gaydar managed to realise the situation in the coal industry after which documents were signed to ease critical tension in miners' collectives. A mechanism of interaction between the government and miners was found and Gaydar took a great deal of responsibility in the realisation of this mechanism, Kislyuk said.

"The resignation of the first vice-premier makes miners doubt that their interests will be understood by the government," he said.

Yavlinskiy Unaware of Being Possible Gaydar Replacement

LD1601164794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Leaders of the Yavlinskiy bloc, prominent economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy told Interfax on Sunday that he knew nothing about the possibility of replacing Gaydar in the reorganized government.

"No one has talked with me about this," he said. The news about Yavlinskiy's possible government appointment was revealed by Yegor Gaydar during a briefing on Sunday with reference to his talks with Prime Minister Chernomyrdin.

Asked by Interfax if he would accept such a proposal if it were made, Yavlinskiy said: "I don't think so, although it's early yet to speak about this."

Does Not Expect Government Post

LD1601182994 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1630 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] [Announcer] We spoke to Grigoriy Yavlinskiy on the telephone today.

[Begin recording] [Yavlinskiy] The fact that Yegor Gaydar did not want to be a decorative figure is quite understandable. This confirms the thought that it is not right to use one's name to adorn the government. Therefore, I believe, this was not a surprise. He has been aware for quite a long time that he cannot influence the policy, he still continued to create an illusion that these reforms are such and such and that they should proceed in such and such a way and that this is indeed the government's policy of reforms.

[Unidentified correspondent] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, if you are offered a post in the government, will you agree?

[Yavlinskiy] Who exactly will offer it to me?

[Unidentified correspondent] The prime minister, probably, or maybe the president.

[Yavlinskiy] I think it is unlikely that the president will propose this to me.

[Unidentified correspondent] What about the prime minister?

[Yavlinskiy] This is of no importance.

[Unidentified correspondent] Let us say this happened. Would you enter the new government or do you also believe that now it is impossible to do anything in the government?

[Yavlinskiy] I could formulate very many proposals that I believe are the necessary prerequisites for the government to be able to improve the situation in a limited period of time, let us say over a year. These prerequisites include cadre reshuffles, the elimination of corruption in the government, a clear-cut political policy with regard to reforms, the absence of compromises on what has to be done and, first and foremost, the acknowledgment of what was done wrong with the aim of correcting it. I think that nobody is ready for this. [end recording]

Says Gaydar 'Incompetent'

LD1801104294 Tehran IRNA in English 1026 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] Moscow, Jan. 18, IRNA—Several Russian parliamentarians have termed acceptance of the resignation of first deputy prime minister Yegor Gaydar by President Boris Yeltsin as a political maneuver and accused Gaydar of being incompetent in the administration of affairs. Russian economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy who is said to succeed Gaydar, in an interview with IRNA here Monday described Gaydar as an incompetent person for membership in the new cabinet.

He said that Gaydar always introduced the former speaker of parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov as the main obstacle on the way of economic reforms but during the past three months since the dissolution of the parliament he did not carry out any constructive measure.

Comparing certain members of the government with that of the former Soviet Union, he claimed that some of them only thought about having fashionable offices, modern cars and luxury houses instead of paying attention to more important matters. He reiterated that he would not accept the post of deputy prime minister.

Russia's Choice Officials React to Gaydar Resignation

Secretary Yushenkov Comments

LD1601185294 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jan 94

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A meeting of the bureau of the parliamentary faction of the Russia's Choice bloc was held this morning. Sergey Yushenkov, secretary of the faction, said that members of the bureau unanimously backed Yegor Gaydar's decision to resign from the post of first deputy prime minister. Yushenkov also said that Minister of Finance Boris Fedorov also intends to leave the government because, like Gaydar, he is unable to bear responsibility for a policy that will inevitably result in a new spiral of inflation. However, Boris Fedorov himself has so far declined to give any information about his own plans. He said that Yegor Gaydar's statement on his refusal to join the government came as a complete surprise to him.

Meanwhile, leading Russian banking circles have told Interfax that they regard Boris Fedorov as a symbol of reform in Russia and that they might perceive his departure from the top echelons of the government as symptomatic of a possible change in the direction of the reforms.

At his press conference, Yegor Gaydar stated that Viktor Chernomyrdin had asked him during their conversation about his view of the possible appointment of Grigoriy Yavlinskiy to the post of first deputy prime minister in the new government. Gaydar said that he would warmly support his candidacy. As for Yavlinskiy, the leader of the Yabloko parliamentary bloc, he told the Interfax agency that no one has offered him a place in the Russian Government. Asked whether he would accept such an offer were it to be forthcoming, Yavlinsky replied: Most probably not, but all the same it is too soon to say. Moreover, an offer to join the government in the post of first deputy prime minister has to come from the president, and I have my doubts as to whether I could work with Boris Yeltsin, Yavlinskiy stressed.

Faction Coordinator Responds

LD1601211394 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Kirill Ignatyev, the coordinator for the Russia's Choice faction in the State Duma, believes that Yegor Gaydar will not accept any proposal to return to the government, even if the president himself asks him. In an interview with Interfax, Ignatyev remarked that Gaydar would not agree to a proposal to take any posts in the State Duma. According to the faction's coordinator, Gaydar, as its leader, intends to concentrate his efforts on organizing the work of the faction, and also on creating an apparatus and regional structures for the Russia's Choice movement. Ignatyev said that the main aim of such work is to prepare for municipal elections scheduled for the coming months, in which Russia's Choice plans to achieve greater success than during the elections to the State Duma.

Group Adopts Statement

LD1701125694 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1247 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lydmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—The "Russia's Choice" parliamentary group has just adopted a statement at its meeting on the resignation of First Vice-Premier Yegor Gaydar.

Group member Fedor Shelov-Kovedyaev told journalists that, according to the statement, there are at least two wings in the government, one of which, according to the lawmaker, "rests on laurels and feels well at the expense of the other".

The pragmatic wing parasitizes on reform-minded cabinet members, shifting onto them responsibility for all actions by the government, he continued. Shelov-Kovedyaev said that the group's statement will be soon made public and, according to the legislator, will give a helping hand to Gaydar.

Shelov-Kovedyaev said that "according to the latest information, Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin is interested in continuing negotiations" on this issue.

Replying to ITAR-TASS, another group member, Gennadiy Burbulis, former secretary of state, said: "I believe that everything will be clear within the next two days. Then, it will be possible to draw conclusions and make comments. It is too early now to say anything".

Member Pochinok Reacts

LD1701165594 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Member of the Russia's Choice [RC] faction in the State Duma Aleksandr Pochinok says Gaydar's statement about his stepping down as cabinet member is an

indication that although he does want to stay where he is to implement his ideas, much of the decision making is done behind his back.

Gaydar's resignation should not be taken as an attempt to bring down the president or his government, Pochinok told INTERFAX on Monday. He pledged no opposition to Yeltsin or the government on the RC's part, adding that Gaydar was in the mood for constructive dialogue.

Pochinok sees Gaydar's move as the most honest option, saying that one must resign if unable to implement his ideas.

At the same time, Pochinok, who is a real contender for the post of chairman of the planning and budgetary committee, says he sees no replacement for Gaydar.

More Russia's Choice Comment

LD1701170094 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] "Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin's decision to form a new government without Yegor Gaydar is, I feel, final, as is the prime minister's decision to weaken the economic reform thrust," Sergey Kovalyov, one of the leaders of the Russia's Choice group in the State Duma, told INTERFAX. In his view, this decision "is likely to bring about serious negative consequences."

Kovalyov emphasized that it had been a mistake to regard Russia's Choice as the government party.

"I kept repeating in every speech I made that we could not be a government party without having a decisive influence in the government," he said.

The Russia's Choice group intended to nominate Mikhail Mityukov to the position of deputy speaker. In his words, the group will not let Liberal Democratic Party [LDPR] leader Vladimir Zhirinovskiy chair the International Affairs Committee.

"We will vote against this, and democratically-minded deputies have enough votes to make this impossible. What is more, I suspect that the communists also do not intend to let the LDPR have that position," Kovalyov explained.

He said that his group will support election of either Vladimir Lukin of the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc or former first deputy foreign minister Anatoliy Adamishin to that position.

Liberal Democratic Party Welcomes Resignation

LD1601192094 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1825 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Russia's Liberal Democratic Party will welcome Yegor Gaydar's decision to resign, this party's first vice chairman and State Duma deputy Stanislav Zhebrovsky told Interfax.

He believes, however, that "one private move does not determine everything." Besides Gaydar and Ella Pamfilova, the government must be quit by vice premiers Anatoly Chubays and Boris Fedorov, because "they are responsible for the country's ruin."

Zhebrovsky is convinced that resignation under such a far- fetched pretext as disagreement with the decision to allocate $500 Mn to the construction of a parliamentary center and to unite the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems" attests to the bankruptcy of the current policy. He thinks that for the Russian economy $500 Mn is not the sum that determines success or failure of a government program.

Zhirinovskiy Response Noted

LD1701165494 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the LDPR [Liberal Democratic Party of Russia] group in the Russian State Duma, told Interfax that he was pleased with the decision made by Yegor Gaydar not to serve as vice premier in the new government.

"Some time ago I told both Boris Yeltsin and Viktor Chernomyrdin: 'Remove Gaydar, Chubays, Fedorov and Kozyrev and you'll have a perfect government,'" Zhirinovskiy emphasized.

In his view, Gaydar "must be replaced by a normal industrialist." Zhirinovskiy made it plain that his parliamentary group was "prepared to endorse any government the president wants but I am saying on behalf of my group: 'Boris Nikolayevich, I implore you to accept Gaydar's resignation.'"

Business Circles Concerned Over Resignation

LD1701113494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1127 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—"By announcing his resignation, Yegor Gaydar set the Russian president before the alternative: Either to go on with the reform policy, or to allow the government to be controlled by those officials who are backed by directors of ineffective economy," Chairman of the Economic Freedom Party Konstantin Borovoy told ITAR-TASS.

Other business people told ITAR-TASS about their anxiety over the growing instability on the Russian market, which will inevitably follow the resignation of Yegor Gaydar from the post of first deputy prime minister.

In the opinion of Mikhail Dunin, vice president of the Moscow Commodity Exchange, "Gaydar's resignation will trigger panic at commodity and stock exchanges, as a result of which the dollar exchange rate may reach 1,500 - 1,600 roubles before the end of January." The

growth of the dollar exchange rate will "automatically lead to another round of inflation, to the growth of prices, including hard currency prices." Dunin stated with regret that "hopes for the stabilisation of the situation on the Russian market, that emerged after December 12, are not coming true, which may enhance the prestige of Zhirinovskiy." Aside from it Dunin, the same as other business people, complained that "endless cataclysms in the Russian Government do not allow business people to implement long-term programmes, because the unpredictable character of the policy, pursued by the Cabinet of Ministers, does not make it possible to forecast the situation on the Russian market."

Oleg Vinogradov, chairman of the board of directors of the Mosexpo joint-stock company, regards Gaydar's announcement of his resignation as an "untimely step". He accused the first deputy prime minister of giving up the attempts to form a government, which would guarantee the continuation of the reform."

Sergey Popov, adviser to the president of the Association of Russian Banks, has an opinion of his own about Gaydar's statement. He believes that Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, a possible successor of Gaydar on the post of first deputy prime minister, "is more adequate to Russian realities." Popov likes Yavlinskiy's desire to get from the prime minister the guarantees of the implementation of a clear programme of actions and to take upon himself the responsibility for the reform course.

Further Businessmen Comment

PM1801100194 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 94 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed roundup: "Dollar Has Increased in Price by 46 Rubles"]

[Text] D.N. Sukhinenko, chairman of the board of the RINAKO investment company: One can only express sincere regret at Yegor Gaydar's decision to leave the government.

"Gaydar could and should have fought to the end despite the setback at the elections and the complexity of mutual relations in the government." In the opinion of Sukhinenko, who together with a number of other representatives of private business calls himself a critic of Gaydar's team, in Russia's interests Gaydar should have continued working. Now we shall get a traditional government.

The reformers' setback shows that economic problems cannot be resolved from above.

A.V. Zakharov, general director of the Moscow currency exchange: It can be said unequivocally that Yegor Gaydar's resignation is destabilizing the currency market even more. In general this market has already reacted to the political instability in Russia: The lack of clarity as to what kind of government their will be and, most importantly, what its actions will be, has largely affected the rise in the dollar exchange rate since the beginning of the year. And on Monday immediately after Gaydar's resignation announcement, the rate changed again by nearly 50 rubles and was 1,402 rubles for one U.S. dollar.

Of course it is perhaps very hard to speak in detail right now of any economic program. At any rate until the budget for the current quarter and for the year have been examined, at least preliminarily, in parliament. And in this situation the participants in the currency market link their hopes with specific individuals embodying a particular course. And we know what course Yegor Gaydar embodied and what hopes businessmen linked with him.

M.B. Khodorkovskiy, chairman of the "Menatepa" council of directors: I think that right now we should not dramatize the situation in connection with Gaydar's voluntary resignation. The point is that we are faced with the objective need for a small change of economic course caused by the aggravation of the nonpayments problem and the need to implement the structural restructuring of industry. Of course this could cause the intensification of inflation processes and the further decline of the ruble exchange rate but at the same time structural restructuring will become the basis for subsequent financial stabilization, for the removal of social tension in the country.

As regards fears that the government is now drastically altering its course, then I can say one thing on this subject: If investments are made sensibly, if money goes on specific, carefully worked through and well controlled programs, then it is absurd to speak of a change of course. If the funds invested are spent on "propping up" all weak and inefficient enterprises, then it will indeed be necessary to sound the alarm. And whoever is appointed to the post of minister of the economy will shed a lot of light on this question.

Bankers View Resignation

LD1701165694 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Gaydar's resignation may alleviate the confrontation between those in the government who favor tough and fast reforms, and those who prefer gradual ones, the Deputy Chairman of Incombank's council of experts, Sergey Popov, told INTERFAX.

According to Popov, the possibility that Fedorov may resign after Gaydar and Pamfilov did "will not lead to a crisis in the government." He views Yavlinskiy as the most acceptable candidate for the post of finance minister.

The Director of the foreign relations department of Stolichny Bank, Aleksnder Skvortsov, said he hopes that

Gaydar's resignation will not be accepted. According to him, only Gaydar can conclude the reforms launched in Russia.

The Deputy Chairman of NGS Bank, Viktor Shabrov, said that "the policy of reforms is not carried out by one man; the question is who will replace him."

A majority of spokesmen for commercial banks do not link the fall of the ruble with the government reshuffling, since Fedorov envisaged it at the end of last year. However, the rate of the fall heightened "because of instability in the highest echelons of power."

Commentary Views Gaydar Departure

PM1701183594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 94 First Edition p 1

[Mikhail Berger commentary: "Gaydar Sees No Circumstances in Which He Would Retract His Resignation Statement"]

[Text] Yegor Gaydar stated to IZVESTIYA Monday morning [17 January] that he will remain in his post until the new government is announced, and sees no circumstances in which he would retract his resignation statement. Thus it is neither blackmail, nor an ultimatum. Gaydar also said that he does not aspire to any parliamentary committee and does not harbor any special illusions concerning his possibilities of influencing the Duma's work. He will remain only as faction leader, and the maximum which he can expect to do is to block, in conjunction with the president's veto, the most destructive decisions of the lower house. Gaydar believes that, together with some affiliated associations and deputies, his faction could muster up to 34 percent and prevent the Duma from overturning a presidential veto by the necessary two-thirds of the vote.

Gaydar's resignation was unexpected, but no less unexpected than an earthquake in a seismic zone. It is possible to differ about the actual policy proposed by Gaydar two years ago and to assess the results of these efforts differently, but the liberalization of prices, the appearance of a certain freedom of consumer choice, privatization —all this is directly linked to Gaydar and his team. As are also, however, the fall in the living standards of a significant number of people, the shutdown of production units, and the other serious problems connected with attempts to cure chronic, inveterate totalitarianism by the use of shock therapy.

Even when in late 1992 Yeltsin was forced under heavy pressure from the Supreme Soviet to dismiss Gaydar, Viktor Chernomyrdin—at least initially—continued the Gaydar line. This is why Gaydar's second arrival in the cabinet last September was seen as an entirely logical development.

But in the months that followed Gaydar's return the disposition of forces in the country and in the structures of power themselves changed substantially. The government and the president have shown increasing readiness to soften economic policy and support individual sectors and enterprises; that is, to save inefficient state enterprises with the aid of the morphine of inflation.

In this time Chernomyrdin himself, and his political weight, have also changed substantially. He has not only formally become the state's number two, but he has also managed to strengthen his personal influence on the policy being carried out. The premier, who a year ago was viewed as a transitional, temporary figure, has proved an unusually robust and firm politician. And whereas some time ago key economic decisions were, as a rule, not adopted without coordination or discussion with Gaydar, in recent weeks—especially following the elections—the first vice premier's influence has been reduced virtually to zero.

The point is not even that decisions on unaffordable expenditure on a new parliamentary center or on terms for the unification of monetary systems with Belarus that are unfavorable for Russia were adopted without any participation whatsoever by Gaydar. It has become obvious that the time of the apparatus is coming, when fundamental decisions both on economic policy and on personnel are adopted under the influence of closest aides, and not first deputies.

In addition, the powerful duo of the premier and the chairman of the Bank of Russia, based, apart from anything else, on the personal empathy of Chernomyrdin and Gerashchenko, has made possible the adoption of all decisions in financial policy directly, so to speak, without discussions in government or anywhere else.

In these conditions Gaydar had increasingly become a "front" for reassuring the Russian authorities' Western fans. Moreover, the impression was arising that Gaydar himself agreed to such a role. Then last Sunday he declared himself unwilling to play this role and to link his name with the economic policy being carried out. A considerably bold, but at the same time also pragmatic, move for a man concerned about his political future.

As for the government, in the present circumstances Boris Fedorov's decision to go or stay takes on crucial significance. If the finance minister goes also, it will be very hard for Yeltsin and Chernomyrdin to convince anyone that the policy of market reforms is being maintained. In conversation with IZVESTIYA Boris Fedorov himself did not say that he would follow Gaydar's example. By midday on Monday, when this commentary was being prepared, neither the president nor the premier had made any proposals on this score. At the same time there are no reports that Fedorov has changed his terms for continuing work in the government. As we know, he stated earlier that he would not work with Aleksandr Zaveryukha.

Be that as it may, with the departure of Gaydar the romantic period of market economy reform, in which a group of young academics tried to complete an economic

revolution without having sufficient political support or a firm social base, comes to an end.

Now begins the period of industrial romanticism, in which a group of experienced managers, drawing on the support of a powerful economic lobby, will try to overcome the crisis with the aid of the economic inflation pump. This period, in Gaydar's opinion, cannot in any way be a long one.

Scenarios Considered

PM1801105394 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 94 First Edition p 2

[Report by Vasiliy Kononenko under general heading: "Resignation of 'Father of Reforms' Could Cause Government Crisis"]

[Excerpts] Ye. Gaydar's unexpected statement on the impossibility of staying in the new cabinet is the first manifestation of party affiliation in Russia's top organs of power and not a manifestation of the individual participation of particular politicians in them. [passage omitted]

Two options remain for the development of events around the creation of a new government team. Since Ye. Gaydar intends to demonstrate firmness in his decision (advisers close to him are absolutely convinced of this and they rule out the possibility of political bluffing in this case) a government crisis could most likely arise, to overcome which the president will either have to embark on the risky step of proposing something like the outline for a coalition government or give the premier carte blanche.

In the latter version it seems possible that a pro-Chernomyrdin will be created in the government and in parliament which, representatives of "Russia's Choice" believe, could be formed by the factions of the Communists, Agrarian Union members, the Party of Russian Unity and Accord, the Democratic Party of Russia, and "Yabloko." The government team thus constituted would inevitably pursue a pro-inflationist policy and there would be no place in it for representatives of "Russia's Choice." It is not out of the question that with this development of events other Gaydar supporters would leave the government (A. Chubays remains in his post only by virtue of a party decision—he cannot be responsible for the government's economic policy).

After the president's meeting with the premier it became known that the "Russia's Choice" bloc does not intend to declare that it is in opposition to the government.

Reasons for Resignation Viewed

PM1801120394 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 94 First Edition p 2

[Article by journalist Irina Savvateyeva under general heading: "Resignation of 'Father of Reforms' Could Cause Government Crisis"]

[Text] One must think that on Sunday Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin had already laid out the government cards preparing to name his four vice premiers. But Yegor Gaydar muddled up all the premier's cards by refusing to take the post of first vice premier in the reorganized government.

Why? This post was guaranteed him through the endeavors of the president. Initially it was believed he would be in charge of 13 federal organs, including the ministries of the economy, finances, and foreign policy relations and the Goskomimushchestvo [State Committee for the Administration of State Property]. But experience of work with Chernomyrdin over the past four months (also in the post of first vice premier, incidentally) has given Yegor Timurovich no grounds for illusions.

"Gaydar had nothing to do. He had no functions left. Chernomyrdin had plugged every hole for him," one high-ranking government official commented on the position of the "father" of Russian reforms in the present cabinet of ministers.

Obviously, before 13 December Yegor Gaydar was gambling on a victory for his bloc at the elections. The press was engaged in a thorough discussion of the possibility that he would be nominated for the post of prime minister.... The results of the elections buried all hopes. Most of all they reinforced the positions of Chernomyrdin, who after the victory of Zhirinovskiy and the success of the Communists, remained in the role of a "centrist"—a favorite and honored role among Russian politicians and soviet directors.

To all appearances Gaydar's position would in no way have been strengthened in the "renewed" government. The Goskomimushchestvo was dropped from the list of departments under his control after Chubays was appointed vice premier by Yeltsin personally. And what does being in charge of the Ministry of Finances mean when Boris Fedorov is alive? Or in charge of foreign economic relations when Aleksandr Shokhin is in good health? (Rumor has it that Chernomyrdin favors Shokhin more than Gaydar—probably after Aleksandr Nikolayevich also declared himself to be a centrist and began to abuse Yegor Timurovich). And, finally, what does it mean to be in charge of the Ministry of the Economy, controlled by we do not understand what, when all sectorial industrial departments are subordinate to top-ranking First Vice Premier Oleg Soskovets? Probably the true role which Viktor Chernomyrdin intended for the second first vice premier was the role of whipping boy. After all, when prices leap after the unification of the Russian ruble with the Belarusian "hare" there will have to be someone to blame for the "ill-considered consequences of the shock reforms."

Will Yeltsin accept Gaydar's resignation?

To judge by the tone of the statement made by Vyacheslav Kostikov, the president's press secretary, on Sunday, Boris Nikolayevich would very much like to

refuse it. But to refuse it would mean not simply leaving Gaydar and repealing (or deferring) a decision on the unification of the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems and putting a ban on the construction of the parliament building. To refuse Gaydar's resignation would mean embarking on strengthening the reformist wing in the government. And ultimately embarking on confrontation with Chernomyrdin who has essentially become the second man in the country and who, incidentally, relies on the support of two very powerful lobbies—the industrial and agrarian lobbies. The president can hardly allow himself such whims in the present political situation.

Incidentally, if you compare this with September 1993, when Yeltsin imposed Gaydar on Chernomyrdin (although the latter hastened to state that it was his own initiative) then the difference is not only in the strength of the president's political positions. At the time the economic situation was somewhat different: The country was sliding toward hyperinflation. But today, not least thanks to Gaydar's efforts, the ruble does not look that bad. So that there would seem to be no urgent, insurmountable need for so-called "monetarists." In addition Boris Fedorov is still in the government for the time being.

Incidentally, if Gaydar goes the post of first vice premier will be free. And the prime minister could very well offer it to the finances minister. If, of course, Viktor Stepanovich or Boris Nikolayevich is interested in Fedorov remaining in the government. Then, you see, the Zaveryukha-Fedorov conflict would be resolved, even if only partially.

It is true that this would scarcely make any easier the further fate of the Ministry of Finances leader in a government of sector lobbyists. But if you consider that in the present situation the positions of Boris Fedorov's long-standing opponent, Central Bank Chairman Viktor Gerashchenko, are automatically strengthened, then it may be supposed that following Gaydar and Social Protection Minister Ella Pamfilova, the Ministry of Finances leader will also think of resigning.

Resignation Seen as Logical

MK1801105094 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Jan 94 p 1

[Ivan Zasurskiy report in the "Perspective" column under general headline: "Yegor Gaydar Has Made His Choice, and So Has Boris Yeltsin. The Game of Radical Economic Reforms in Russia Has Ended for the Time Being"]

[Text] Yegor Gaydar's resignation is in no way capable of changing the character of the economic policy pursued by Viktor Chernomyrdin, because the incumbent government had none even after Gaydar's comeback. The fact is that it has been more than six months now that the reformist theoretical mood has been pushed into the background relative to the cabinet's ongoing fire-fighting activity. When, in responding to questions about his possible appointment to replace Gaydar, Grigoriy Yavlinskiy described the government as "Soviet," it was not his intention to use profanity. Simply, the "Soviet" government has always been a secondary organ with respect to the ideological apparatus structures in Staraya Ploshchad. And now, when the government has meekly moved into the White House (while the president's administration went into Staraya Ploshchad), everything has been put into place. It is another matter whether there is a perception about the need for an economic policy in Staraya Ploshchad.

From the start, Yegor Gaydar claimed starring roles in the cabinet. After the election defeat Viktor Chernomyrdin demoted Gaydar to the "second" first vice premier. The formal sharing of the status of first deputy with Soskovets, who can be defined as the cabinet's industry leader, effectively deprived the ex-premier of the opportunity to influence the government's conduct of any economic policy. In this context the mention of the ambitious and rational Yavlinskiy as a replacement for the ideologically reformist decoration can only evoke a smile. Although it needs to be recognized that if the EPICenter head had no substantial material and ideological basic structure, he would have had to consent.

What then substitutes for economic policy in the present cabinet of ministers? Here one should go back to the trinity that featured in Chernomyrdin's speech in parliament. Apparently, this is social policy as a method of preserving and multiplying the well-being of the (entire) people; the second, that is to say, "anti-shock" wind for the reforms; and support and assistance for producers. Naturally these are guidelines for practical people, not a concept for long-term development. The practical peoples' weight in the Russian cabinet of ministers is so substantial, however, that the interests of industrial, agrarian, and financial lobbies will acquire the character of economic policy in the very near future. At the same time, since Gaydar's pressure on the president has after all led to his effective resignation, the entire spectrum of economic policy options will be presented in parliament. It is clear that such a scenario can result in a curious lineup in the system of power distribution. The government, while remaining a purely working body, will be implementing political decisions by the president's administration and economic decisions by parliament.

Radical reform advocates will consider such a scheme typical for a third-world country. It is necessary to admit, however, that an alternative to this at the present stage is only a reformist dictatorship, and therefore many, many upheavals.

The evolution of the above scheme on the contrary contributes to political stability, which is necessary to overcome many complexes of the post-socialist power, including the irrationality of the politicized populace. Specifically this will mean for the Russian economy the maintaining of inflation at its current level with the haphazard flourishing or degradation of various

branches. Until a new perception has come about of what is a real economic reform for Russia.

Shokhin Insists on Remaining Deputy Prime Minister

LD1701134394 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1329 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Oleg Velichko]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—Russian chief foreign debt negotiator Aleksandr Shokhin will agree to remain in the government only in case he keeps the post of a deputy prime minister.

"I may occupy the post of the minister for CIS affairs only in case it envisages the status of a vice-premier", Shokhin told TASS on Monday.

He added that the government is currently facing a complicated situation as it has to combine financial stabilisation with the policy of promoting production which needs enormous finances.

The current reorganisation of the government also complicates the situation, according to Shokhin.

"The existing situation in the country calls for two necessary things: a strict definition of concrete measures and the sharing of roles in the government", he stressed.

Sergey Aleksashenko Appointed Commission Head

LD1401181094 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1554 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—Boris Yeltsin appointed today Sergey Aleksashenko chairman of the Commission for Auditor's Activities under the Russian president.

Chernomyrdin's True Role, Intentions Analyzed

MK1501115094 Moscow MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 15 Jan 94 p 1

[Mikhail Gurevich report: "Who Does Chernomyrdin Like? Viktor Stepanovich and Vladimir Volfovich: a Secret Alliance?"]

[Text] To obtain a solid gain in an election campaign it is not at all necessary to take part in it. Among politicians experiencing a feeling of profound satisfaction from the results of the 12 December voting is apparently Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin.

Back in November, when few doubted the success of Russia's Choice, representatives of this bloc were complaining to MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS' correspondent about the constant counteraction on the part of the head of the Council of Ministers which, according to them, went as far as telegrams with direct instructions to sink the Gaydarites. Naturally there was no doubt that in the event of Choice's victory (the convincing victory on which it was counting at the time) the premises of the head of the Russian Government could have received a new occupant.

In order not to fall out with Viktor Stepanovich completely, Russia's Choice made a statement about supporting his candidacy, specifying that the ongoing reform course must remain unchanged. On the other hand, Shakhray's Party of Russian Unity and Accord from the very start of the campaign was far more definitive in its statements: "coalition," "a compromise figure," "the premier must stay on," and "Gaydar has no chances," which evoked strong sympathies on Chernomyrdin's part.

However, the current head of the Council of Ministers is looking for friends not only among the more or less decent Shakhray followers. Russia's Choice, having refused to participate in preliminary "consultations," cited among its reasons the "fickleness" of its interlocutors, who are constantly changing earlier approved candidacies. On 4 January Zhirinovskiy said that the Liberal Democratic Party would propose for this post 61-year-old Vladimir Gusev, former first secretary of Saratov Obkom and former deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is currently listed on the Liberal Democratic Party slate (although not a member of this party) as vice president of the Promyshlennik corporation. According to information at MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS' disposal, Chernomyrdin has asked Zhirinovskiy to propose his candidate for the post of speaker.

Viktor Stepanovich also has another trump up his sleeve: Under the constitution, he may perform the president's functions for four months, should the president resign. And then? It is silly to make guesses, but the mass media are being very actively placed under government control (meaning its apparatus-"economic" half). Consider the fact that they have their own press minister (head of the Council of Ministers press service); the recent attempts to take control of the former Parliament Hour program; a certain list of a dozen papers worthy of generous state subsidizing; and the actually revived State TV and Radio Committee, directed according to the government concept. It should be noted that some mass media organizations are already confidently calling Chernomyrdin not only the number two man in the state (which corresponds to his post) but also as catching up with the president in the charisma of a "nationwide leader." "Master," "real man" [muzhik], "our man," "tough," "laconic" (therefore intelligent), "a strong hand," and so forth: the image being created is very impressive indeed.

The former head of Gazprom received his high post 13 months ago as a "compromise figure." "A sound economic manager" was how he was described: It is thanks to him that our homes are still warm. A world-level manager; our gas workers have outdone Ruhrgaz and included lucrative contracts (according to experts, Ruhrgaz has already recovered and is again picking up).

It is difficult, however, to enter big-time politics and stay "a mere specialist." For instance, Gaydar, who in November 1991 was a little-known cabinet theoretician, by the time of his second coming to the government had Russia's Choice and the Association of Private and Privatized Enterprises to his credit. There is no doubt that Viktor Stepanovich too has had enough time to acquire numerous political, economic, and commercial contacts presupposing certain obligations.

Chernomyrdin promised to make public his ideas about the personal composition of the Council of Ministers on 17 January. So far it is only known that in response to the supposition that Gaydar and Soskovets will be first vice premiers and Yarov and Zaveryukha plain vice premiers, he said: "You nearly got it." And also that he has invited Shokhin to stay in the government. Boris Fedorov, on the contrary, will apparently be shown the door. Nonetheless, Yeltsin's decision to leave Chubays as vice premier no matter what has added optimism to the Russia's Choice part of the cabinet. Which after the latest events (the decision to build a new parliament complex and the "ill-advised and destructive" agreement with Belarus on the exchange of its currency for the ruble at a 1:1 rate) has started talking about the need "to distance itself" from the mistakes of the government, and it may be ready to distance itself too far.

Number of Vice Premiers May Increase

MK1401113094 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 3

[Andrey Bagrov report: "Personnel Shakeup in the Government. Chubays Keeps His Status"]

[Text] The president has sharply thickened the plot of appointments to a new cabinet by his edict yesterday under which Anatoliy Chubays stays on as chairman of the State Committee for the Management of State Property and is appointed deputy chairman of the Russian Government "over and above the number of deputies determined by the edict of 10 January."

Vladimir Mau, aide to Yegor Gaydar, says that the confirmation of Anatoliy Chubays' status is in line with the provision of the 1991 law on privatization stating that head of the State Committee for the Management of State Property simultaneously has vice premier status. Thus, the decision that Chubays should keep his "privatization minister" office has automatically led to keeping him in the number of government leaders. Remarkably, his status is now in fact higher than that of the other deputy chairmen because the president decided his fate apart from the government as a whole. According to unofficial information, Chubays's appointment came as a surprise also for the head of the cabinet.

If one is to stay in the legal fairway, certain conclusions can be drawn from the reservation that Anatoliy Chubays was appointed "over and above" the quota of deputy government chairmen set three days before that (four vice premiers). The president's edict sets down a 4+N formula of the number of vice premiers. This was also indirectly confirmed yesterday by Vladimir Shumeyko, elected chairman of the Federation Council, who let it be known that the Russian political Olympus is inclined to regard leaders of the Federation Council as having been "posted" from their former jobs. Thus he can nominally keep his position of first deputy premier, in which case the number of deputy chairmen grows to six.

Amending one edict by another increases chances of unexpected decisions. It has become known from sources close to the president that another vice premier, Aleksandr Shokhin, is seen as a candidate for the position of minister for cooperation with CIS member countries, but he cannot keep his vice premier rank. Shokhin's realm has already been dealt a painful blow. The Russian Agency for International Cooperation and Development, whose chairman he was, has been placed under the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations with the obscure status of a "state institution." Neither does Shokhin have any chances whatever to take the place of the premier's long-time friend Oleg Davydov as head of the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations. Shokhin, tipped as a candidate for the head of the Duma's international affairs committee, let it be known guardedly, after the Duma session yesterday, that he did not rule out chances of filling the post of minister for CIS affairs. His uneasiness about whether this position would include vice premier rank was betrayed by the persistently repeated idea that "relations with the CIS should be directed by a specially trained vice premier."

It is not clear whether one more vice premier, Boris Fedorov, would be able to carry into effect his plans of control over the entire financial sphere including the steering of the ruble rate policy and the external debt problem. Fedorov announced a press conference for 18 January (the composition of the government is to be announced on 17 January) where he is expected to announce whether he is happy with the position of finance minister which, according to its status, has always measured up to that of a vice premier.

'Sources' View New Government Posts, Structure

LD1501194694 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1457 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] Aleksandr Zaveryukha and Yuriy Yarov will apparently retain their present posts of vice premiers in Russia's government and Yegor Gaydar and Oleg Soskovets will remain on the posts of first vice premiers, reported sources in the apparatus of the Russian government who preferred to stay anonymous. They are convinced that on January 18 Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin will call these names along with the name of Vice Premier Anatoliy Chubays, who has already been appointed to this post by a presidential decree, as Chernomyrdin promised at the meeting with the Federal Assembly deputies - heads of administrations on previous Friday.

The same sources drew attention of Interfax to the fact that federal executive bodies, including 23 ministries and 44 state committees, committees, departments, federal services and agencies (their list is applied to Yeltsin's decree "On Structure of Federal Executive Bodies" dated January 10) have been distributed according to the principle of "five verticals."

According to the sources, "these verticals" will be spread among functions of vice premiers as follows (according to the order in which ministries and departments were presented in the supplement to the presidential decree on corresponding ministries and departments):

- Oleg Soskovets will be entrusted with monitoring of federal bodies' structures by the first of the "verticals" - fuel and energy complex, transport and communication, construction and architecture, industrial policy and defense industry, metallurgy and machine building, chemical and oil-chemical industry, space agency;

- Yegor Gaydar will be in charge of economics and finances, foreign economic relations, and cooperation with CIS countries, antimonopoly policy and support to new economic structures, management of state property, customs and tax services, currency and export control, extraction, production, and export of precious metals and stones;

- the issues of education, science, and culture, labor and employment, social security, youth's problems, physical culture and tourism, mass media and cinematography, migration and archive services will be conferred on Yuriy Yarov;

- along with the issues of the agricultural industrial complex Aleksandr Zaveryukha will be responsible for the problems of trade, environmental and natural resources security, land survey and cartography, hydrometeorology and environmental monitoring;

- and, finally, President Yeltsin will apparently take responsibility for the fifth, "power vertical," that is beginning with defense, foreign and domestic affairs and ending with nuclear and radiation security, report the same sources in the governmental circles.

Consequently, the number of deputies of the chairman of the RF government, including the two first deputies, will not exceed four, as it was foreseen in the presidential decree "On Structure of Federal Executive Bodies."

As far as Chubays is concerned, he is not included into the "big four" determined by this decree but according to one of the next presidential decrees was appointed additionally to them. This is "an absolutely logical move," believe the sources in the Cabinet, "because his major responsibility - privatization - is a process underway in Russia which is to be concluded earlier or later."

Sources in the governmental apparatus do not rule out possibility of slight changes in distribution of duties between the future vice premiers.

Agrarian Party Leader Views Political Situation

BR1401144594 Brussels LE SOIR in French 14 Jan 94 p 2

[Interview with Agrarian Party Leader in the Russian Parliament Anatoly Lukianov by Pierre Celerier in Moscow; date not given: "Development of The System in Russia And Bill Clinton's Visit to Moscow"]

[Text] [Celerier] You are a deputy in the Duma [the new Russian parliament], but also, at the age of 63, one of its most senior members. For health reasons you are not attending your trial as a participant in the August 1991 putsch. How, then, can you take part in sittings of the Duma?

[Lukianov] I am genuinely sick, suffering from complications linked with pneumonia, which is why I will have to return to the hospital in two weeks. That explains my absence from the trial. However, as you know, in the Duma every vote counts and costs dearly. That is why I preferred not to take my temperature or spare my efforts to place myself at the service of the Duma. Furthermore, contrary to all expectations I have been appointed the senior representative of the block of independent representatives. Consequently, I will have to shoulder the responsibility of temporary president of the chamber while awaiting the election of the real president.

[Celerier] You were president of the Supreme Soviet, the parliament of the USSR. What common points do you see between that body and the Duma?

[Lukianov] Our Duma is an institution which has barely seen the light of day, but it still bears traces of its Soviet predecessors. Above all, it defends the interests of the people who elected it.

Thus, the voters are entitled to recall their deputy if he fails to respect the urgent mandate entrusted to him. The deputy is bound by an indissoluble link with the people who elected him.

[Celerier] And the differences?

[Lukianov] In the era of the Supreme Soviet and the supreme body of the Congress of People's Deputies, the multiparty system only appeared at the very last moment, just before our Soviet system was destroyed. Unlike in the West, back then our parties had emerged from political groups that had broken away from the Communist party.

With the Duma, for the first time in more than 70 years, party- based elections have been held. In the future, many issues will have to be settled by agreement between these parties.

[Celerier] Is it possible that the Communists and the agrarians, of whom you are one of the leaders, will join forces with the ultranationalists led by Vladimir Zhirinovskiy?

[Lukianov] You are wrong, the only group with which we could really collaborate is the democratic party of Nikolay Travkin. For, you will be surprised to hear, in my considered opinion, the positions adopted by Vladimir Zhirinovskiy are closer to those of the Choice of Russia (the presidential party - LE SOIR editor's note) than to ours. For instance, he supported the new Constitution and its presidential regime as well as the abolition of the old Supreme Soviet by the coup d'etat in October. All these being measures that we fought, but which fit in remarkably well with the slogans of the "democrats."

"The West Should Not Try To Destabilize Us"

[Celerier] How do you value Bill Clinton's visit to Moscow?

[Lukianov] This meeting with Mr. Yeltsin is necessary, but it will only prove beneficial if the U.S. President understands that our president did not succeed in winning a vote of confidence in the elections of 12 December. Unfortunately, I fear that the U.S. Administration is not ready to take account of the new hand that has been dealt, or of the fact that in Russia the specter of politics looms much larger than the "democrats" in power would like to have them believe.

If I could meet with President Clinton I could ensure him that we are not anti-American. However, on the other hand, neither the United States nor Europe should try to destabilize our geopolitical position, especially with NATO.

[Celerier] Precisely, how do you see Bill Clinton's efforts at mediation in the dispute between Russia and the Ukraine on nuclear weapons?

[Lukianov] In private I would dissuade him from becoming involved in either our internal or external affairs. However, if he really wants to lower the popularity of Boris Yeltsin, then he should by all means interfere. Remember Gorbachev. Any foreign arbitrator in a conflict involving two Slavic countries runs the risk of being sorely disappointed. Nonetheless, I wish him good luck.

Constitutional Court Reinstates Justice

LD1401141794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1216 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Viktor Luchin has been reinstated as a Constitutional Court (CC) justice and ended his hunger strike.

"I do not feel triumphant," he told Interfax Friday morning [14 January]. "The justices acted as professionals." He said that the court members reinstated him in a nine to four vote by secret ballot.

Luchin went on a hunger strike Tuesday demanding a vote on his membership which was suspended on December 1 because of his alleged political activities.

A CC source told Interfax that in a seven to six vote by show of hands the court had put off consideration of reinstating Valery Zorkin.

The source believes that by reinstating Luchin the CC justices "disavowed the presidential decree advising that the seats occupied by Luchin and Zorkin should be regarded vacant."

Government Decree Averting Press Strike Assessed

PM1401142194 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 2

[Article by Tatyana Akkuratova: "Will Journalists Become Shareholders at Last?"]

[Text] A Russian Federation Government decree has been adopted on "Providing Printing Products for the Publication and Distribution of the Media." The document envisages suspending Government Decree No. 1233 on the revaluation of fixed capital at national economic enterprises for three months in the printing industry sphere.

As is known, the revaluation and resultant major increase in the value of printing enterprises' fixed capital will mean approximately a sixfold (according to PRESSA and IZVESTIYA publishing houses' experts) increase in the prices of printing services. It is doubtful whether even the richest and most prosperous publication would be able to stand a such a price rise. To protect their rights, the collectives of the major Moscow and a number of local newspapers were even prepared to declare a strike. Although the strike was averted when, at a meeting with the chief editors of newspapers and the leaders of journalists' organizations, Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin promised to give the journalists' demands rapid consideration.

The promise was carried out within the agreed period. But what position will the papers be in in three months' time? By then, Vladimir Kupelkin, general director of the Association of Publishers and Chief Editors, believes, a mechanism for compensating press organs for extra costs will be in place. It is to be devised by the Finance Ministry, the Economy Ministry, and the Committee on the Press. The new decree instructs the Committee on the Press to join interested ministries, departments, and organizations in preparing proposals on tax concessions for the printed media and also for publications printing children's, academic, and other socially significant literature. The Communications Ministry is to joint interested organizations in preparing proposals within a month on improving the system for the delivery and distribution of newspapers and journals.

But perhaps the most important element in the government decree is the point which gives the Russian Federation State Property Management Committee and the Committee on the Press, in conjunction with interested ministries, departments, and organizations, two months

to submit to the government proposals on the procedure for privatizing printing enterprises, including those that are members of publishing and printing complexes—proposals connected with the participation of media and book publishers' editorial board collectives in their flotation and privatization. If these additions are adopted, the editorial boards' collectives, that is those who produce the papers, will be able to participate in the flotation and privatization of printing works and, consequently, also end up owning them. Hitherto, the journalists responsible for the end product, the news, which the printing base was created to print, have been entirely dependent on the latter. Suffice it to say that our paper in particular has had to make a difficult choice on several occasions: either pay large fines for being forced to miss the deadline for making up the pages, when an important event occurs in the country and the time when the news comes in does not fit the deadline, or report the event 24 hours late.

ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI has written more than once of the need for journalists to participate in the flotation and privatization of printing works. Journalists managed to get this provision included in the privatization program for 1993. Unfortunately, it was not implemented. Is this going to happen again?

International Affairs

Kravchuk Holds News Conference on Return From Moscow

LD1501143094 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1720 GMT 14 Jan 94

[News conference by President Leonid Kravchuk with unidentified reporters at Borispil Airport in Kiev on 14 January—recorded]

[Text] [Reporter] Can you say if the document that was signed by the three presidents in the Kremlin today will have to be ratified by the Ukrainian parliament? Will it help resolve the issue of disarmament in general, both in Europe and on CIS territory? Is this primarily a new step or not? Third, to what extent will it help Ukraine's economy?

[Kravchuk] The document is a continuation of the Ukrainian Supreme Council resolutions. If you recall, the reservations that it put forth were about compensation for tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, their technical maintenance, financial and technical aid, and security guarantees. These, approximately, were the main reservations of the Supreme Council. When you read that document, and it will be published, you will find that all of those demands were met. In other words, we can positively state that the executive branch has not been acting contrary to the Supreme Council resolutions but acting toward fulfilling the reservations put forth by the Supreme Council. I would like to emphasize this fact so that no one thinks, as some try to imply, that the president and the parliament were following their own separate courses. We did satisfy the reservations. I said in the past—and I am confirming it now—that we must join the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. This is my deep conviction, because everyone has already joined it—Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and 131 countries. This is a normal step for Ukraine. This is why I hope that when we inform our parliament about our actions since December... [pauses] a very difficult time for Ukraine, which had to withstand pressure from all over the world. Not everyone understood our steps, not everyone understood our actions and there were grounds for this. This, I think, is a matter of principle. Now about your question as to who this document will serve. Both the talks with the U.S. President in Kiev and the trilateral talks have confirmed one irrefutable truth—problems can be resolved only on the path of compromises and agreements. No reservations, no guarantees expressed in documents or agreements or declarations or anything else will be realized if one or another state follows the policy of confrontation instead of compromise. If, for instance, Ukraine... [pauses] now they say that Ukraine has been brought to its knees. This is absurd. First, Ukraine has come out of the situation with credit. We will be compensated and given assistance; we will be respected politically and in other ways. If we had opposed the adopted course and stood in the way of nuclear disarmament—and it was anticipated—if Ukraine had failed to fulfill its obligations, it would have blocked the further development of nuclear disarmament. It would have blocked it. START II depends on the resolution of the START I issue. I hope that there will be START III as well, and the final goal will be achieved in the total dismantling of nuclear weapons on our planet. Thus, Ukraine, having resolved this issue, unblocked nuclear disarmament for the whole world, for all of humanity. By taking this step Ukraine testified to the fact that there are no separate paths for Ukraine—it follows the path of civilization and all human interest. This is the main issue for all the European and world community. By taking this step we have raised Ukraine's political prestige and image, we have confirmed that Ukraine's policies are predictable.

Finally, there is one more point. Whatever they might say, there is an arrangement of forces in the world, an arrangement along political lines. And today, great powers are standing as the cornerstones of these forces and lines, including the United States of America. Relations among states develop depending on the influence made by these great powers. Whether one likes it or not, that's the way it is. Ambitions are out of place here. This is not a policy but just the basic way of thinking. If we—contrary to the world's civilized development—failed to accept compromises...[pauses] it does not mean that we have been humiliated; we have compromised, but the other party has also made compromises. Thus, we established normal relations.

Let us imagine that Ukraine opposes the good will of other states, the good will of the world-wide development of nuclear disarmament, and the interests of the world states. However, not just their interests, but the common interests of mankind—nuclear disarmament. This is important, because we can take into account the interests of the state. However, it will not coincide with the interests of mankind.

What will be the international opinion of Ukraine? We, three presidents, of the United States, Ukraine, and Russia—have reached an agreement and solved the issue in a civilized manner, in line with the reservations and the interests of the people of Ukraine. There are also economic perspectives opening for us; this was mentioned by President Clinton in Kiev. In other words, Ukraine is seen as a state that took those brakes off, enabling cooperation with the United States, with international financial organizations, and with Russia. Our acting prime minister, Yukhym Leonidovych Zvyahilskyy, and Defense Minister Radetskyy met today with their Russian counterparts and resolved a wide range of specific issues. Because, this [as heard] is the main barrier. Why is it the main barrier? Take for example, the military and technical side of the whole matter. We have nuclear weapons that we inherited, but we do not produce. Everyone, who understands at least something about this is aware that we are not capable of servicing them, providing maintenance. We just cannot keep them as a heavy burden on our shoulders. We cannot maintain them with due responsibility for our future and the

future of our neighbors and all mankind. This has been proven by specialists and by everyone. Those who do not understand this are the ones who do not want to.

Who is servicing nuclear weapons today? Russia. Well, when the president of Russia says: If you want to have nuclear weapons, why should we service them? He is right, is he not? This is a military and technical aspect. Further, look at the aspect of the use of nuclear weapons. Everybody knows it, and our minister said this, that some time in 1999 the service life of the nuclear weapons would expire. Excuse me, I am telling the entire nation that no reservations, no resolutions or edicts will prevent [as heard] the president, the defense minister, or the government when the service life of these horrible weapons expires. We are obliged to remove them because they are more dreadful than all the Chernobyl-type accidents taken together. And those people who accuse the executive authority today—they either do not understand this or take advantage so as to confirm their particular policy, their particular course.

There is yet another aspect. Take, for example, most superficial things. They say that recoding is possible, that something can be done to retain the nuclear arsenal as a deterrent. First, when it comes to the issue of recoding, it cannot be an abstract code. A question arises: Who is to be given the new code? Well, you ask those extreme forces—they will tell you who—I do not want to repeat the words. But the one who is to be given the new code—will he wait until we finish recoding? What if someone would like it to be done, suddenly?

Second, nuclear weapons require a nuclear industry. Without it these are not nuclear weapons. If all this is summed up...[pauses] and also it is necessary to have testing grounds to carry out tests. We do not have these. There is a whole complex of problems facing Ukraine.

The situation can be assessed as follows: We have nuclear weapons. You do not touch us because if you come and do something suddenly, they can explode spontaneously, therefore you risk dying, together with us. In other words, this is an inhuman act. We have a dangerous thing in our hands which may explode. If it explodes and an opponent dies, it is his business, he himself makes his way to such an end. But he wants millions of people to die, our neighbors included. Who can put up with this? Who can regard this as normal? I cannot stop wondering if this is a political game, if this is an election game—one can understand this somehow. But it is necessary to sit down at a table, place facts here and facts there. If these are facts they are facts. But if these are mere words and appeals, and deception of the people who experienced the Chernobyl catastrophe—who knows what it is—if these are attempts to put our people in jeopardy, presenting the people of the young state—which is just in the making—as a monster to the whole world, so that they would not recognize it in Europe and the world. This is not serious. This is why I think that this is our political, economic, humanistic victory.

This is our victory. Not mine, not Ukraine's but our common victory. The victory of Ukraine, Russia, the United States of America, the victory of the entire world. If we all maintain friendship and normal relations with Russia and the United States and others, we will have our guarantees. But to oppose this, and exhibiting our high ambitions and proceeding from postulates having nothing to do with the understanding of the situation may be dangerous.

I am happy with one matter: Those particularly vocal about this are a minority and they demonstrate their total ignorance, and second, presenting themselves as patriots they, as a matter of fact, do not help Ukraine with their actions, to put it mildly.

[Reporter, HOLOS UKRAYINY newspaper] Leonid Makarovych, I have a question. The answer to it concerns many people: Will our state's national security be consolidated after today's signing [of the trilateral agreement]? If so, what changes for the better can be expected?

[Kravchuk] It will be consolidated in the following aspect: We have already experienced a completely different attitude toward Ukraine—from Russia, for example. You have seen a different attitude toward us by the United States during the U.S. President's visit. I also have reports that NATO countries have come to understand Ukraine after receiving the bit of information which we still have to think over today. This way, the international environment and our neighbors have accepted Ukraine as a state that does not want evil but wants to live in friendship, partnership, and cooperation with other countries. This is the first point. Second, you understand that it is an illusion to say that the weapons we have owned were a deterrent. I have already told you about this deterrence; this is just a danger of deterrence rather than the deterrent. Because we are unable to produce, operate, restore, or service them—because we have nothing: neither industry nor testing grounds—what kind of deterrence can we talk about? This is an illusion of deterrence, but it was hammered into people's heads. The weapons have not been a guarantee of security, but a source of threat—and not only to Ukraine. This way, having won support from certain people and states, including powerful states, we have obtained security. Security does not mean signed documents. You know how many pacts have already been signed in history, how many other documents have been signed. However, they have been insufficient because a state policy has been against what has been signed. We want our policy to be implemented in real terms, in line with our civilized and anticipated concept, which has been approved. I am convinced that we have obtained security and opened the path to economic cooperation. We have also achieved a state's image. We have acted in line with our Supreme Council, and I am convinced that the majority of the people of Ukraine want this.

[Reporter] At the recent news conference with Moldovan President Snegur you said something like this: The

danger coming from the revanchist forces in Russia has increased. If such factors in the policy of our neighbor dominate, how do you think the signed agreement can be fulfilled and what mechanism of ensuring our national security do you see as the head of state?

[Kravchuk] Well, first, I said this a little differently. I said I felt anxiety. [passage indistinct] However, the words danger and anxiety have subtle differences in connotation. Danger means that this is somewhere here... [pauses] As far as anxiety is concerned, it is known to me, and every person must feel it when complicated processes are under way. However, I will repeat that this is not a state policy but a political trend. Political trends have occurred in history, you know about that. Let us take the last 300 years, and we will find different trends in all spheres of social life: spiritual and political spheres, and this is a normal democratic phenomenon. However, such a tendency must not become a state policy. To prevent this, we must cooperate first of all with Russia. There are 205 million of us in Russia and Ukraine. Difficult processes are under way in our country too. One should not attribute them only to Russia. They are everywhere. Revanchists, nationalists, national patriots reveal themselves everywhere; they are coming out, because such is the time now. Let us prevent them from standing in the way of progressive development. This is a democratic way. However, to prevent this from becoming a state policy is our responsibility and our common concern. When we say that we have signed an agreement by three presidents today, this speaks volumes. Normal cooperation begins from this point: politically, economically, and spiritually. Those forces that today are in opposition will remain there. Opposition must exist, and there is nothing scary about this. However, one must not allow aggressiveness, and antipeople, antihumanitarian moods, hidden under patriotism, to dominate in society. We must not allow this. That is to say, I feel anxiety but I also have hope, because 14 January is a new page of understanding our problems, and a page comprised of new steps. I believe that these steps are aimed against what makes all of us apprehensive.

[Reporter] At a brief news conference today the President of the United States of America noted that by signing the documents Ukraine has acquired...[pauses] has become more influential, has acquired more significance among countries of the world, and that many states will now cooperate with Ukraine. Moreover, Kostikov, press secretary of Russian President Boris Yeltsin, informed journalists that Great Britain is supposedly giving us security guarantees already. Is this true?

[Kravchuk] Great Britain has given us security guarantees previously, but they were not formalized [ne oformleni]. You remember when I visited Great Britain: In the treaty I signed with the prime minister of Great Britain, it was noted that Great Britain—I do not remember the exact formula [word indistinct]—grants Ukraine guarantees from the point of view of national security. However, this was an abstract formula. Now, the interpretation in the documents we signed is that both Great Britain and France I hope, and others will join in with this. But I want to repeat: Life is life. There are our hopes, opinions, our philosophical understanding of life in this world and society, but there are also practical actions. If we act practically and in an understandable way, we will in the end understand ourselves. I see that we take many steps that are difficult to explain. I will frankly say that December was possibly the most difficult time in our life for Ukraine, because the issue was real, not ephemeral or illusionary. The issue was the real international isolation of Ukraine, and this meant... I do not even want to use these words. But, for example, under a slogan of ultrapatriotism, all this is forgotten and people are deceived that Ukraine can survive in isolation or confrontation, or by conducting a policy aimed against states [word indistinct] and the interests of mankind. This is the truth, and everyone knows it. Excuse me, not everyone. Those who want to know—know this. Those who do not want to know, or those who know but think differently, will never understand anyone. Due to that, this is what I believe.

[Reporter] Mr. President, you used the words abstract formula to describe the agreement (?and so on). However, the statement saying that we have gained friends such as the United States and Russia also sounds abstract. Will you specify how those agreements you signed in Moscow guarantee Ukraine's security.

[Kravchuk] First, let us put it this way. It is precisely noted that Russia and Ukraine [as heard] respect territorial integrity, the inviolability of borders, sovereignty, and independence of Ukraine. They respect and support Ukraine's independence, and this was stated by President Clinton. He always begins his speeches with the statement that Ukraine's independence is an important element of U.S. foreign policy. This is the first point. The second one is: If we join the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, those guarantees will acquire a more specific, I would say precise, nature, since today we are an undefined state. We have inherited nuclear weapons. We can neither use nor handle them, and I have talked about this, but we have not joined the treaty. What do we really want? Do we want to proliferate them or sell them? What do we want? The treaty has been joined by 131 countries. We must join the treaty. Then, the guarantees will acquire real meaning. Because they might ask us: Why do you want guarantees if you are a nuclear state? You can attack someone, not be attacked. This is an illusion, a nonsense that has developed in political... [pauses] I would say that this is political dualism, of which everyone is sick and tired. Only one who never wants to see anything does not see this. This is the point. Therefore, it is noted there. Additionally, an entire chapter was devoted to the economic situation, which gives Ukraine a real opportunity to join Europe's economic structure, including with Russia—(?no, not including)—but in the

east with Russia, and with other states. An economic space is opening up, an international financial space. We are received as a state that fulfills its obligations, which were announced, by the way, during its independence. I would say that it is not prestigious for a state to jump from one point to another, even more so, in such a delicate and global sphere as nuclear (?weapons).

[UNIAN correspondent] Do you think Ukraine, the United States, and Russia put a different value, I mean material value, on the nuclear weapons, which again will bring up the issue of disarmament?

[Kravchuk] I do not think so. The United States, Ukraine, and Russia will conduct a joint examination. In addition, we already have international estimates on this. This is in no way a new thing. Let us say, each kilogram of uranium, its quality, there are evaluations, then, subtract the cost for enrichment of uranium, and it will be all taken into account. Given the mutual desire, I see no problems here. We said the following: We fulfill our obligations and you fulfill your obligations. If one party stops fulfilling its obligations, then the other party automatically stops fulfilling its part. I said this plainly. According to the agreement, we, for example, withdraw strategic nuclear weapons, 200 warheads, then we automatically receive compensation and the compensation for the tactical nuclear weapons. If someone somewhere begins to manipulate, we will publish a relevant statement that we are being deceived, let us speak plainly. However, I hope that under the current consensus of three presidents—and what we achieved—three presidents have signed this agreement—when I spoke with the U.S. leadership they said: Mr. President, we put our honor at stake; we put the authority of a great world power at stake. For us, it was the most important thing—exactly what we were pressing for. Not because we do not trust Russia. Complex processes are going on in Russia, both political and economic ones, just like here. So we should reckon with the possibilities of collisions and problems. But this is the state today that can be a guarantor, both for us and Russia. We have entered this system of thinking, this system of creating, this system of understanding, which [word indistinct] for the benefit of Ukraine.

[Correspondent] What is the term for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons and what is the compensation for the strategic and tactical nuclear weapons? In addition, are our debts for oil and gas to be canceled?

[Kravchuk] There are two constituents of this issue. The question of tactical nuclear weapons will soon be examined by experts from the United States, Russia, and Ukraine; they will evaluate the price, taking into account the (?weight) of what was transferred by us in 1991-92, and afterward we will determine the forms of compensation. Our debts will be taken into account, too. Compensation for strategic nuclear weapons has been determined long ago. The nuclear weapons will be withdrawn, say, these 200 warheads, their weight taken into account, and Ukraine will receive heat-generating elements for nuclear power plants. That is, we agreed as follows: We estimate that we will be secured... [pauses] for four or five years, will we not? [Kravchuk asks some of his aides] Thus, we will have free uranium for our power plants over a period of seven years. You should understand how important our power engineering is for us... [pauses] All this will be determined on the basis of the strict evaluations which will take into account our experience, as well as world experience. The term of the withdrawal will be adjusted depending on our capabilities. I have informed you that in 1999 the service life of all our warheads will come to an end. Is that so? [one of Kravchuk's aides replies "Yes"] [18 second passage indistinct] (?I would not have signed it) if the Supreme Council, say, (?does not now) ratify it [words indistinct]. I do not know. The service life of warheads [words indistinct] is coming up in March. And I know that the unforeseen could occur (?here)—for Ukraine and for the world. (?So am I) going to look at this document? If I do not [word indistinct] it today, then I will be told tomorrow—you work it out yourself. What sort of a state will we be in then? And who will understand us? What sort of civilized state and country, which (?like a savage) [words indistinct]. It is a terrible thing that our country brandishes its weapons and has no idea what to do with them. I am terrified to listen to some of our politicians who know nothing about politics, who do not want to know anything and do not want to take heed of anyone, and are driven only by their ambitions. Let me now read you a verse written by one of the members of the Ukrainian delegation wishing our country all the best. I will not name the author (?until afterwards). [Words indistinct] has written this verse. I want to speak about that [word indistinct], that spiritual, about that climate, which existed here when people could see that they had done something good for the state, for Ukraine. They did not give in, nor (?bend down), nor get down on their knees. When all were equal [words indistinct] it is obvious when someone is telling the truth and when [words indistinct] [Kravchuk reads the verse]

It is good. [words indistinct]. Normal people understand what has happened now. A page has been turned. A page of new thinking has been turned, a new attitude toward Ukraine. And if we act consistently, this page will be filled with [word indistinct] words. The main thing is that Ukraine has not [as heard] started on the road of the great desire of mankind—to get rid of nuclear weapons. (?It was wanted all the time) that it becomes a brake and enters history just in this way. And those politicians, who are now shouting something different, let them listen to those people. I wish you all the best.

Zlenko: Accord 'Not Subject' to Ratification

LD1601213794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1828 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Speaking on national TV, Ukraine's Foreign Minister, Anatoliy Zlenko, said that "the document signed in Moscow is not subject to ratification by Ukraine's parliament." Under the bill on international agreements

adopted by Ukraine's parliament recently, such statements are not subject to the process of ratification, he pointed out. The document signed by the Russian, American and Ukrainian presidents in Moscow "serves to develop the resolution on the ratification of START-1 adopted by the Ukrainian parliament, Zlenko said.

According to him, no nuclear country recognized the way Ukraine's parliament ratified START-1. "International isolation could bring Ukraine to its knees. Its independence would be out of the question," the foreign minister said.

Earlier a number of influential members of Ukraine's parliament strongly criticized the trilateral document on Ukraine's nuclear disarmament signed in Moscow.

On Moscow's Refusal To Wipe Out Debt

LD1401173994 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko has expressed surprise and disagreement with his Russian counterpart Andrey Kozyrev's statement saying Moscow will not write off Kiev's debt for fuel imports from Russia as compensation for the withdrawal of the nuclear weapons Ukraine had inherited from ex-USSR. He spoke in an interview with Interfax on Friday.

Ukraine's debt for fuel imports from Russia ran at more than 1 Tn rubles as of December 1, 1993, according to Russia's government statistical committee.

Earlier in the day, Kozyrev told Interfax that Kiev would receive fuel grade uranium for its nuclear reactors but "any write-off of the Ukrainian debt is out of the question."

For his own part, President Kravchuk, speaking at a news conference in the Ukrainian embassy on Friday, said Moscow was committed to compensating Ukraine both for long range and tactical nuclear weapons.

Kravchuk said Ukraine is to receive compensation in fuel grade uranium for the withdrawal of the long range weapons from its territory but Moscow will be solely in charge of exports of 500 tons of the uranium reprocessed from the nuclear warheads.

The Ukrainian leader said experts on the three sides were yet to define the amount and form of compensation for the tactical nuclear weapons to be withdrawn from Ukraine. He believes one option is to write off Kiev's debt for fuel imports from Russia.

As he rejected Kozyrev's statement, the Ukrainian minister said the write off formula was laid down in the tripartite agreement.

Urges EEC To Evaluate Nonnuclear Goal

WS1701104494 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] In the opinion of Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko, the efforts of the Ukrainian, Russian, and U.S. presidents and diplomats have been successful. Mutual compromises, unconventional approaches, and the consideration of national interests of all three states, including, primarily, Ukraine, have brought to realization the political decision to withdrawal nuclear weapons from Ukrainian territory. Specific mechanisms for the political, economic, technical, and financial promotion of this difficult process by the states of the EEC have already been worked out. Anatoliy Zlenko said that the EEC has to objectively evaluate the desire of Ukraine to acquire nonnuclear status.

Zlenko, Shmarov, Radetskyy View Nuclear Accord

LD1601155194 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 2020 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Discussion program entitled "A nonnuclear Ukraine—Outcome of the Ukrainian-U.S.-Russian summit," the first program in a series, presented by correspondents Eduard Kotenko and Ihor Storozhuk, with Deputy Prime Minister Valeriy Mikolayovich Shmarov, Foreign Minister Anatoliy Maksymovych Zlenko, and Defense Minister Vitaliy Hryhorovych Radetskyy]

[Text] [First speaker] As we already reported, a trilateral Ukrainian-U.S.-Russian summit took place with the participation of Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk, U.S. President Bill Clinton, and Russian President Boris Yeltsin. A document of a history-making significance was signed.

Today, Ukrainian Deputy Prime Minister Valeriy Shmarov, Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko, and Defense Minister Vitaliy Radetskyy are taking part in our television [as heard] program.

I think we will be able to talk about the significance of this document and analyze in detail the signing process [word indistinct] etc. Valeriy Mykolayovych [Shmarov], let us begin with the preceding events so as to understand how exactly we achieved the signing of the document.

[Shmarov] I think it will be interesting to tell you briefly a little bit more than those dry reports. The government entrusted me to head [words indistinct].

First, what happened yesterday was, as a matter of fact, [words indistinct], the completion of a rather lengthy marathon, a political and diplomatic marathon which we have been running for a long time, for several months. Undoubtedly, it was preceded by very intensive and complicated work. That was the Massandra agreement and its achievements, as you know, although they were not final. That was also large-scope work on drafting the Supreme Council resolution on ratification of the

START I Treaty. There was further work in line with this resolution as of 18 November [1993].

I should say that the Ukrainian delegation was guided by that very document, because the Supreme Council resolution actually mapped out a plan of work to be done to put that resolution into effect, that is to say, to make international START I effective. So-called reservations or conditions, 13 conditions, were formulated. The resolution enables this document to come into force, in other words, it gave us the right to accede to START I on condition that these reservations are fulfilled.

You probably remember these conditions, the principal ones [words indistinct]. The first gives security guarantees to Ukraine in case [words indistinct]. The second issue deals with compensation for the value of the nuclear weapons, especially its nuclear part, i.e. nuclear ammunition. The issue of compensation deals with the issue of returning this value to Ukraine somehow. At the same time, [words indistinct] about compensation for those nuclear weapons which have already been transferred from Ukraine, the so-called tactical weapons which were transferred from Ukraine during 1991 and 1992 [passage indistinct].

The third issue deals with rendering economic, financial, and technical assistance to Ukraine and implementing this complicated disarmament project. This is a rather [words indistinct] task, particularly in view of the present-day state of our economy.

Well, there is also the issue, as you remember, [words indistinct] deactivating, dismantling, and eliminating nuclear weapons in compliance with the agreement. These weapons, these facilities—especially the nuclear warheads—will have to be serviced by those who manufactured them, by those who are supposed to service them, who are responsible for guaranteeing this technology, these weapons.

These are probably the main points we focused on while elaborating the framework, I would say, of the agreement, which had to answer the questions posed by the resolution.

One of the new forms of work we offered at the end of last year was trilateral negotiations. Working on this problem, we have long proposed involving the United States as a party in the negotiations, as a guarantor, and as a source of expertise in these matters. I would say that this proposal of ours was a success and, beginning in December 1993, we started elaborating the set tasks and decisions on a trilateral basis.

The first such trilateral negotiations were held in Kiev on 16 December. I must say that we were not used to this form of negotiation, and that round of the was rather complicated. However, we arrived at an understanding and realized that this was a very effective way of working. Having such a strong arbiter involved in a dispute on this issue speeded up the adoption of decisions to some extent and made them unbiased. We believe that this was a positive factor.

The second round of negotiations was held for several days in Washington from 3 December, where a documented basis was formed for the future statement, the trilateral agreement the presidents have just signed, as you know. I must say it was a rather difficult piece of work, which was already obvious in Washington, but all those involved were willing to solve the issue by taking into account the standpoint of each of the three sides.

Our work was a matter of principle. I would not say it was in any way idyllic. Solutions came hard, and there were continuous consultations. The presidents were constantly in touch; the vice presidents and foreign ministers, or the State Department, constantly exchanged information. In other words, it was not the work of three groups of experts or officials, but that of a colossal number of people, starting with the top leaders of the three countries.

I should also add that the U.S. President was directly involved in this matter, by way of his appraisal and his conduct, and this did a lot for the final outcome. He received our delegation, evaluated the situation, and heard out our proposals. I would say that his opinions made quite a contribution to the conduct of the U.S. delegation and the final agreement [words indistinct].

Secretary of State Christopher was also actively and personally involved, as were many other U.S. officials. I believe the quality of the work at the stage I have described was probably appreciated yesterday in Moscow, because the text signed by the three presidents was almost identical with the text we drafted in three languages, except for a few minor technical or linguistic corrections.

I think this is only a chronological account of the developments. As for a comment on specific issues, my colleagues and I can now answer your questions.

[First speaker] Thus, following the summits in Kiev and Moscow, the process of Ukraine's nuclear disarmament is beginning to take real shape. Vitaliy Hryhorovych [Radetskyy], could you tell us in detail about the military-technical aspect of this process?

[Radetskyy] After the Supreme Council adopted the resolution, I was summoned to the president who gave me the task of reporting today's true situation with nuclear arms. I studied the resolution in the greatest of detail, and I would like to draw your attention to a few issues.

First, taking account of the fact that Ukraine was not directly involved in the negotiations on the preparation of the START treaty, Ukraine's president and government must be advised to hold negotiations with the relevant states and international organizations on the following issues:

1. On international guarantees of Ukraine's national security;
2. On the conditions of economic, financial, scientific, and technical aid toward the fulfillment of the treaty obligations;
3. On the manufacturer's servicing of nuclear warheads and combat missile systems under guarantee;
4. On the negotiation of conditions for the funding of the inspection envisaged by the treaty;
5. On the possibility of peaceful use of silos under fail-safe control;
6. On the conditions of using fissionable weapon materials released as a result of nuclear arms elimination;
7. On the guarantees of compensation for the material value of nuclear weapon components.
And, 12. [number as heard] the president of Ukraine must be advised to approve a schedule for the elimination of strategic offensive weapons specified in this resolution and ensure that it is adhered to.

I would also like to draw your attention to Clause 10 of this Supreme Council resolution. The conditions of compensation are extended to involve also tactical nuclear weapons transferred from the territory of Ukraine to Russia in 1992.

We went further and prepared a report for the president, saying that this clause should involve not only the tactical nuclear weapons withdrawn in 1992, but also those withdrawn in 1991. And, second, I drew the president's attention to the issue concerning the possibility of peaceful use of silos under fail-safe control. Here, views differed as to the ways of implementing these clauses, since they concern our security.

[Shmarov] Excuse me, please. I would like to return to the issue of package No. 26. May I?

[Unidentified speakers] Yes, please.

[Shmarov] It has been proposed that we set up an alternative to the package. You heard them: Let's set up a button, and everything will be okay.

[Radetskyy] Yes, such views were expressed.

[Shmarov] I would like to respond to this with a final clarification. We did indeed give this task to our leading scientists in specialist design bureaus dealing with missile control systems who are highly qualified in this area and who worked on this before. They came to the conclusion that the development and manufacturing of what is primitively called a button, but what in fact is a special centralized missile and strategic force control system, would take about seven years. It is what will happen during those seven years what Vitaliy Hryhorovych [Radetskyy] was talking about: the guaranteed service life of the nuclear warheads will expire, and instead of working on what we planned, we would wind up in great trouble. As the army general has already said, the expiry of the guarantee can lead to uncontrolled developments and a situation of nuclear danger. What we are guided by during the implementation of these programs is first of all the need to avoid any nuclear danger in Ukraine. This is my answer to the issue of the button, and experts can provide their own.

[Radetskyy] Let me add to this. You know that I read an article about the silos. I reported to our president that we need the infrastructure currently available within the 43d Missile Army—the people whose training, by the way, will take approximately 10-15 years—in order to tackle other problems. Second, it is high-precision weapons that can be regarded today as advanced weapons which have prospects for the future. We should not forget about these, but I am not going to disclose here all the subtleties.

I reported to the president, and he agreed with me. Accordingly, we will consider this issue in the near future at the Defense Council, where I will deliver a full-scale report on that state, that condition of our armed forces which is to ensure and compensate for the withdrawal of the nuclear weapons. I would like the television audience to understand this correctly.

[Unidentified speaker] Vitaliy Hryhorovych, as a military man [words indistinct] your life, almost completely diverts you from tackling other problems. You are permanently thinking about this problem. In my turn, I would like to speak as a civilian, as a person who is immediately engaged in international politics.

I would like to say this: After Ukraine gained independence, the issue of nuclear weapons was a great obstacle to ensuring Ukraine's full accession to the system of international relations. I would say that we spend no less time than you do thinking day and night about how to prevent these very nuclear weapons from becoming an obstacle and putting our state in a very complicated situation.

I am not going to go back into history and dwell on the way we approached this issue, but I would like to say that it was created in a very complicated situation. It was only due to extraordinary efforts—and, I would say, nonstandard approaches—that we managed to avoid many of the consequences we were anticipating. If there is an opportunity and if we have enough time, I would also like to say how we were moved toward this, how we reached those trilateral negotiations, that trilateral agreement.

[Unidentified speaker] Anatoliy Maksymovych. Some people [word indistinct] believed, and I think this opinion still exists, that it is not just the possibility of defending ourselves that we have lost—we did not lose it, as we now understand—but also the international prestige which, in one way or another due to inertia since Soviet times, was attached to our being, supposedly, the world's third nuclear state since the Soviet Union's disintegration. How would you comment on our prestige today?

[Zlenko] First, I would like to say that we managed to save the state's prestige till yesterday's meeting in Moscow, until the signing of the documents. In this connection [pauses]

[Unidentified speaker] And after the meeting?

[Zlenko] And after the meeting, certainly. It was consolidated to an ever higher degree. Absolutely, indisputably. I would also like to say that after the Supreme Council ratified START and adopted a relevant resolution, the response of the Western world was openly negative.

This resolution was not recognized as an act of ratification by the United States, Russia, or by almost all the other nuclear states. Western countries reacted accordingly, and attempts were made to place Ukraine in international isolation. Immediately after the ratification, we used appropriate measures to prevent this happening. This included my personal correspondence with a number of ministers from NATO countries, first of all, and from the nuclear states. This included a statement to the UN secretary general, a statement to the NATO secretary general, and to other world and European structures.

Then, I would like to add, there followed an exchange of views between our president and the President of the United States in telephone conversations, and an exchange of relevant letters with the president of the Russian Federation. All this was done in order to prevent our being completely isolated, in order to check the brewing of an attitude in those circles which could bring Ukraine at once to its knees.

At the same time, the situation remained extremely difficult. Very difficult. I would like to say that from the very first moment the Supreme Council adopted this resolution, the president, as you remember, made his own statement. This very statement, saying that he would be forced to return to the issue and raise it once again at the Supreme Council, gave us a chance to continue our work. This gave us a chance to get our foot in the door; it enabled us to make contacts and carry out relevant work. It was a great political and diplomatic move.

Thus, after strenuous diplomatic efforts, we found the mechanism for a trilateral agreement, a trilateral summit, in which Valeriy Mykolayovych [Shmarov] took part, heading our delegation. And the climax of these efforts was the signing of the trilateral agreement.

[Shmarov] Excuse me, Anatoliy Maksymovych. It was asked whether the signing of the agreement leaves us in a state of future dependence and with a loss of authority. I would like to comment on this. Anatoliy Maksymovych [Zlenko] summed it up from a political point of view, and I would like to give some pragmatic information.

After we reached agreement on these issues in Washington, the U.S. Administration confirmed its intention of broad-based economic cooperation. It has already been determined that a large Ukrainian delegation of economists and financiers will go to Washington on 24 January to work at government level on the issues of broad-based economic and financial cooperation.

Also, I had contacts with many representatives of business and financial circles. They all make our future and our cooperation dependent on the agreement that has been signed. I do not think that Ukraine's future, its prestige, are in its stance of some nuclear monster, but I think it is in the way the people will live in Ukraine, in the way its economy and people's well-being will be shaped and developed, and these issues will, probably, be solved through broad international cooperation.

[Zlenko] This is an absolutely unequivocal fact. I would like to share this opinion completely. Moreover, as far as prestige is concerned, I would like to say that prestige, of course, is based on relevant authority of the state. This is an unequivocal fact. You know, if today the state found itself under pressure on all sides, of course, what authority of the state can we talk about? Then, the state's authority is based on a consistent, planned, balanced, and predictable nature of both its domestic and foreign policies. Here is the state's authority.

Referring to what took place in Moscow yesterday, to the preliminary negotiations, I would, first of all, like to say that we managed to achieve a certain compromise in real terms, i.e. to avert the threat of Ukraine's international isolation. It seems to me that this is the main factor. This is what future prestige will rest on. We managed to lead our relations with the United States of America out of the dead-end street.

Economic relations have just been mentioned by Valeriy Mykolayovych [Shmarov]. As far as economic issues are concerned, today, for example, we solve the problem of fuel elements supply. It means that we reduce our expenditures for buying these materials, which means that we will be able to curb further [word indistinct] prices.

[Unidentified speaker] Within the framework of the agreement. But I have in mind what broad cooperation will bring us—investments.

[Zlenko] I understand this [words indistinct]. At present, the United States of America is setting up a foundation of entrepreneurship for small businesses. It will provide the first portion of capital to boost this process. You have mentioned the economic delegation that is to leave these days. It brings along specific programs, specific projects giving an opportunity for initiative. The financing of those 155 million [currency not specified] allocated by the U.S. Congress for economic reform in Ukraine is getting under way. This delegation will have a chance to unlock this money and there are assurances on the part of the U.S. President himself. The minimum sum of financial aid rendered to us for the purposes of nuclear disarmament is $175 million. We know what

other reserves they are talking about and, of course, we will be able to get access to those reserves so as to increase this sum.

At present, we are elaborating a whole series of specific programs and projects that will allow us to use our financial resources accordingly. However, the nuclear armaments issue has always been an obstacle and this is why they ask: Why are there no investments? Well, they all say that the solution of our domestic problems is probably hampered by our legislation as well, whose elaboration has not yet been completed by our deputies, etc. But at the same time, nuclear weapons caused yet another problem, which created a negative political climate around Ukraine. We hope and, of course, we take under strict control the fulfillment of the agreements that we have achieved and this will be our determining policy in relations with the United States and Russia, and, of course, in an opposite direction as well.

This is what people must restore: It first of all concerns solutions to these economic issues, a range of economic issues. It will make it possible to improve people's living standards and check the incessant rise in prices for different goods. This will guarantee the economic well-being of both our state and of each individual therein. This is how I see it. This is where we should now focus our attention, and this is what we will continue working on.

[Radetskyy] Anatoliy Maksymovych, can I add something? You spoke about commitments. The Defense Ministry is drawing up proposals on the provision of housing for servicemen, which will be also taken into account in the United States, on adaptation to conversion, etc. You know the difficult situation servicemen are facing today. These problems will be solved. They will be solved not only by the United States, but also by other states as well. We heard today what the attitude is toward us on these issues. I consider this a priority.

[Zlenko] I would like to finish. When talking about prestige, or importance given to the results, we, and our delegation, were guided by Ukraine's national interests. However, I think that not everyone in Ukraine realizes the essence of these interests. Far from everyone does. Naturally, we were guided by the interests of (?stability) and security, not only in our state, but also in the whole of Europe and the entire world. This is what political pragmatism is all about, and this must be the determining factor for state policy, both domestic and foreign.

[Unidentified speaker] Anatoliy Maksymovych, one could hardly disagree with these comments, but do you not think that a lot about the implementation of this nuclear package of documents and the implementation of these programs, military, social, and technical, now depends on parliament, on whether it will ratify these documents? Does it have to ratify them?

[Zlenko] We must first of all sort out our terminology. Some call it a resolution, others an agreement, still others, a statement. First of all, this document is a trilateral statement. Parliament has just passed a law on international agreements. We know that it determines which documents qualify for international legal status and which do not. This document, naturally, does not qualify as such. One can later provide legal clarification in this respect, but in order to make it clear for everyone today, since there is no time, we are talking about a trilateral statement. I think the media, I mean the audio-visual media, have already reported this. The press has probably not done so yet, because there has indeed been very little time. Anyway, we proceed from the fact that it is a statement.

It is a statement that, in my view, takes account of all the reservations and takes the Supreme Council resolution further. We would not like to create the impression that the executive power went off and did something different from what the Supreme Council instructed it to do. You can compare the resolution and the statement, and you will see the relevant difference. There is a difference, but the main thing is, as Valeriy Mykolayovych [Shmarov] said at the very beginning, that a decision was made on political guarantees, reliable guarantees, of our national security. By whom? By the United States? We used to solve this problem on a bilateral basis. Remember, we had letters from Russia, the United States, Great Britain, and so on. Now it is done on a multilateral basis, as negotiations have been held with Great Britain, and Great Britain has stated its readiness, as the third depository of the [START] Treaty, to provide Ukraine with relevant guarantees. Thus, we are talking about a multilateral basis.

A meeting with the diplomatic corps recently ended in [word indistinct] where I was approached by French Ambassador Peissik, who said he had a letter for me from the French Government, again, concerning guarantees. Do you understand what we are talking about? What does it mean for our state, which is still unsteady on its feet of independence, to receive political guarantees from leading nuclear states? It is a guarantee for the further implementation of our economic reforms. That is what we must pay attention to. It is a guarantee protecting Ukraine's political sovereignty, and so on and so forth.

[Correspondent Ihor Storozhuk] When we say: Guarantees from a certain country, say, Great Britain, what is the meaning of the concept: guarantee? What do they guarantee? That they will not attack us? That we will not attack them?

[Zlenko] Let me, Ihor Anatoliyovych [Storozhuk], quote the statement, and make a few comments. The three presidents confirmed once again that: They will cooperate as full and equal partners. Do you realize what Ukraine is raised to? The level of partners: That the relations between them are to develop on the basis of respect toward each country's independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. Then, second: The presidents recognize the importance of compensating

Ukraine for the value of highly enriched uranium. Valeriy Mykolayovych [Shmarov] already commented on that. Measures were determined as to fair and timely compensation during the withdrawal of nuclear warheads. Further: The three presidents came to a decision on simultaneous actions during the transfer of nuclear warheads from Ukraine and the delivery of fuel elements for Ukraine's nuclear power stations in compensation. We have discussed that.

Further: President Clinton is providing ready guarantees. What are these guarantees? I quote: First: Respect for the independence, sovereignty, and the existing borders. Further: A pledge to refrain from any threat of violence or the use of force against us, and so on. None, I stress, none of their weapons are to be ever used against Ukraine. Further: Again, a pledge to refrain from the use of economic pressure to force a (?CSCE) state to use its inviolable rights of sovereignty in one's interests and thus gain advantage. Understand?

Further: Confirmation of commitment to immediate action in aid of Ukraine as a nonnuclear state party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in case of Ukraine falling victim to an act of aggression or becoming an object of a threat of nuclear aggression. Further: As I said, Great Britain joins here, etc., etc.

President Clinton once again confirmed the United States' commitment to the granting of technical and financial aid for the safe dismantling of nuclear arms and storage of fissionable materials, and so on, and so forth. This is what we are talking about. We are talking about the implementation of Clause 5 of the Supreme Council's resolution. In this connection, I would like to quote this clause, if we have time:

Ukraine as a state that possesses nuclear arms will proceed toward nonnuclear status and gradually get rid of the nuclear arms deployed on its territory provided it receives reliable guarantees of its national security, whereby states will undertake to never use nuclear arms against Ukraine—I told you about that—not to use conventional arms against it and not to resort to any threat of violence—and I told you, the statement rules out any, I stress, any threat of violence. Further: Not to resort to any threat of violence, to respect Ukraine's territorial integrity and inviolability of its borders; to refrain from economic pressure in the settlement of any contentious issues.

As you see, I compared the two. Let my esteemed colleagues, let the people evaluate everything that has been done by the executive power in this short period of time.

[Unidentified correspondent] Could you tell us about the schedule for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

[Shmarov] I would like to answer this question. The appendix to the trilateral statement has an interesting aspect, I would describe it as a first step plan. This partly answers your question, and there are probably many viewers and citizens curious about this issue. We, too, wondered about it. As they say, it is an everyday life situation: One may give something today and refuse tomorrow. Therefore, there is a first step plan that envisages that a section of nuclear warheads, say 10 percent or 200 warheads, is transferred to Russia for dismantling within a specified time, while the same amount of uranium fuel, or uranium-based fuel elements for nuclear power stations, is delivered to Ukraine within the same space of time to be used in atomic power engineering.

Then work will proceed according to the principles worked out by our and Russia's Defense Ministries, because it is a complex technical task. If you remember, President Yeltsin said in Moscow that a new initiative is being drawn up by nuclear states concerning the complete detargetting of nuclear missiles. In fact, there is a search for an organizational formula, and I am convinced that the European side understands it.

But speaking of fuel elements, the main thing is that as soon as we transfer weapons, we must receive compensation immediately. Because, according to our calculations, these fuel elements will last us for about seven years. Recently, I met directors of about five of our nuclear power stations, and I remember how serious they were about the problem. They were asking me to do something about it. I made a certain diplomatic move to get some help with energy fuel, etc. I think that a five to seven year solution to this problem for our nuclear power stations is quite a price. It would account for over 30 percent of our energy balance. We are talking not of millions, but billions of dollars.

[Unidentified correspondent] Unfortunately our time on the program is running out. Of course, we will not be able to discuss all the problems. Ukraine as an independent state has a policy that is consistent not only with the interests of the Ukrainian people, but also with those of the world. Yesterday's summit, and today's discussion of the problems showed that Ukraine unblocked the process of nuclear disarmament on our planet.

[Zlenko] I will allow myself to continue. We are already receiving reactions to what has happened. Yesterday, as soon as I came from Moscow, I read some articles, and I noticed how crudely it was presented, not just what happened there, but the state itself. You must bear in mind the image of the state, its international reputation. You must consider carefully what you are putting into your words, and what the consequences for the state will be. That is what we must draw the media's attention to. This is very important. It is absolutely important, because sometimes, with our ill-considered and rash statements, we are putting our state in a very difficult position. Our state, with a population of 52 million does not deserve this. It has huge intellectual potential, huge resources. It is a huge European state, a guarantor of future European security, as the U.S. President said during the negotiations here in Kiev. You must think about the state, think of what you can and cannot say

today. This is where the future of our state, its independence, and the prosperity of our people lies.

[Shmarov] I would like to say this very briefly. I would like our people to know that all this work is being carried out under very careful control of the military, scientists, involving, where necessary, experts from Russia, from weapon-manufacturing enterprises, etc. I would not like people to have the impression that something is concealed. Everything is under control, in order to prevent any instance of nuclear danger in our state.

Shmarov: Pact Will End 'Isolation'

WS1701094394 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Ukrainian Deputy Prime Minister Valeriy Shmarov has stated that the tripartite declaration on the elimination of nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory and the accompanying appendix, which was just signed in Moscow, is an historic document which has laid the foundation for the actual process of ending Ukraine's economic and political isolation. In addition, the package of documents on denuclearization will enable Ukraine to receive international financial aid, including much-needed investment to help resolve conversion issues, overcome the economic crisis, and provide for the social protection of our people. Scientific studies on the dismantling of nuclear warheads and their secure withdrawal from Ukrainian territory have already been performed. This process will be completed in several stages and controlled by appropriate monitoring commissions.

Other Officials View Issues

WS1701173494

[Editorial Report] Kiev Ukraiyinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian at 1305 GMT on 17 January carries the "Nezhavisimost" program. The first part of the program is an interview with Aleksandr Chalyy, chairman of the Legal Department within the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry, and Konstantin Trishchenko, chief of the Department for Control Over Weapons and Disarmament within the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry by correspondent Syarhey Omelchuk. The second part of the program is a live phone-in question-and-answer program. The subject of the cast addresses the activities of Ukraine in the sphere of denuclearization and results of the tripartite Ukrainian-Russian-U. S. negotiations in Moscow.

At 1313 GMT, touching upon opinions of various political groupings regarding the Moscow agreement, Aleksandr Chalyy says that "this tripartite declaration is the logical continuation of Ukraine's political activities on the international arena," and it fully corresponds to clause No. 9 of the Declaration of the National Sovereignty of Ukraine. In addition, he recalls that 90 percent of the population backed the text of this Declaration and "the Supreme Council has ratified the START treaty with reservations." Responding to the reporter's question on whether nuclear weapons are a deterring factor in relations with Ukraine's neighbors, the chairman of the Legal Department states that this theory was born in the USSR, and it demands the existence of reliable nuclear weapons and an aggressive military policy. "Ukraine has no operational control over its nuclear weapons and this policy cannot be used by us. In addition, we cannot produce nuclear weapons," he adds.

At 1317, when asked to comment on security guarantees, Aleksandr Chalyy enumerates the principles—territorial integrity, inviolability of borders, sovereignty, and independence of Ukraine—saying that this document will be published tomorrow. Further, the talk shifted to prospects of the political development of Crimea. However, Mr. Chalyy refuses to answer this question and says that time will show what happens, however, the nuclear disarmament process does not in any case affect the political processes in the Crimea. "There are many regions even in Russia that want to become independent, however, Russian diplomacy is very careful in meeting their demands."

At 1328 GMT, queried on the compensation mechanism, Konstantin Trishchenko recalls the Massandra agreement and Geneva negotiations on the issue and reminds that "Ukraine will receive free fuel for its nuclear power plants and new jobs will be created in the atomic power engineering field."

In the second part of the program, at 1337 GMT, the listeners again ask about security guarantees for Ukraine and compensation for the Republic. Konstantin Trishchenko recommends that they read tomorrow's newspapers and repeats that the United States is a stable guarantor of Ukraine's security. Next, some listeners ask about the possibility of ratifying this agreement in the Supreme Council. Konstantin Trishchenko responds that the tripartite international treaty will be ratified "by all means."

The final questions concern the general situation in the world regarding the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The end of the program is unmonitorable.

Parliament To Discuss Accord 'Next Week'

LD1601195294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1741 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Anatoly Gordeyev]

[Text] Kiev January 16 TASS—Ukraine's political and public forces are not unanimous in assessing the results of the U.S.- Russian-Ukrainian summit in Moscow.

The Ukrainian parliament expects to discuss next week the agreement signed at the tripartite meeting. However, some opposition deputies, largely representing parties and movements of radical nationalist orientation, have already denounced the agreement reached by the three

presidents and labelled the results of the Moscow meeting as "betrayal of independent Ukraine's interests."

Yuriy Kosenko, head of Ukraine's parliamentary commission for nuclear disarmament, also gave his view on the matter speaking on Sunday in the radio programme "Ukraine and the World." He said he would like to read the texts of the documents before coming up with any legal conclusions about their lawfulness or unlawfulness. This view was supported by Anton Buteyko, chief of the presidential international service, who spoke in the same programme. He emphasised that some ukrainian leaders had rejected the document they had never seen, since it was of a purely confidential character.

Ukrainian Defence Minister Vitaly Radetskyy told reporters that the main issue to be addressed at present was deactivation of the nuclear weapons, which calls for immediate solution because the time of warheads safe keeping was expiring. According to Radetskyy, nuclear disarmament is not to affect in any way the level of defence capability of the Ukrainian armed forces. Moreover, security guarantees and Ukraine's territorial integrity and independence which to be ensured by the leading nuclear powers are designed to guarantee the republic's economic revival and integration into the European and World markets, as well as its recognition as an equal partner in cooperation for peace.

Plyushch Refrains From Comment

LD1501175694 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 0820 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] Kiev, 14 Jan—Ukrainian Parliament Speaker Ivan Plyushch is refraining from comment on the matter of the signing of the tripartite American-Russian-Ukrainian agreement, in accordance with which Ukraine is getting rid of virtually all of its nuclear potential, before the relevant documents are studied. Serhiy Kolesnyk, a member of the Commission for Defense Issues, and Andriy Pecherov, a member of the Supreme Council presidium, have refused to comment on the fact of the signing of the document.

Volodymyr Shcherbyna, leader of the "New Ukraine" faction, assessed the fact of the signing of the treaty positively, on the whole. Giving the reasons for his stance, he asked his opponents to reply to the question of whether they could re-aim the Ukrainian missiles from facilities in the United States to similar facilities in Russia?

People's deputy Vladyslav Nosov, secretary to the Constitutional Commission, said that by signing the agreement in Moscow today the president of Ukraine had exceeded his authority, because in accordance with the current Constitution he does not have the right to dispose of Ukraine's state property (in accordance with the Vienna Convention, the 176 missiles and nuclear warheads on Ukrainian territory are Ukraine's property). According to Nosov, Kravchuk's actions can be assessed as an act of "brutal arbitrariness." As regards impeachment, noted Nosov, the Constitutional Court, if there was one in Ukraine, would have to institute proceedings against the president of Ukraine. Nosov mentioned the vagueness of Ukrainian legislation as one of the reasons for Kravchuk violating the Constitution.

Mykhaylo Shvayko, deputy chairman of the Commission for Economic Reform, noted that the discussion of this treaty in parliament would be very stormy. It is not ruled out, emphasized Shvayko, that Kravchuk will provoke "impeachment" in the Supreme Council.

Volodymyr Kryuchkov, a member of the Commission for Issues of Defense and State Security, believes that implementation of this treaty is unrealistic both for Russia and for Ukraine.

It has been learned from informed sources that America is proposing compensation to Ukraine for the dismantlement of the missiles, which comes to approximately $1 billion. But the dismantlement of one complex of SS-24 missiles costs not less than $10 billion according to approximate calculations, and there are 46 such complexes in Ukraine. In addition, Ukraine currently has 136 (?SS-18) missiles.

Deputy Sets Conditions for Ratification

LD1401181294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Deputy head of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission Yevgeniy Marmazov says the tripartite nuclear disarmament agreement signed in Moscow will be considered by the incumbent parliament because a new one will not be able to convene until May.

In an interview with Interfax-Ukraine, Marmazov said the Supreme Soviet would not ratify the deal unless the conditions it had set for the ratification of the Start-I treaty were met.

Last November, the Supreme Soviet ratified the Start-I agreement but with some strings attached. Among other things, the deputies demanded security guarantees and sufficient compensation for the nuclear weapons Ukraine had inherited from the former Soviet Union.

Under the parliament-approved deal, Kiev is to transfer 36 percent of its long range missiles and 42 percent of the nuclear warheads to Russia.

Deputies Oppose Nuclear Weapons Agreement

LD1401200094 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1600 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Opposition to concluding the trilateral American-Russian-Ukrainian agreement on nuclear weapons on Ukraine's territory has sharply intensified in the parliament of Ukraine. Even moderate deputies now come out against the signing of such a document. According to them, the members of parliament were not even told

about the treaty signed in Moscow by the presidents of the United States of America, Russia, and Ukraine.

In the opinion of the members of parliament, the signing of the Moscow treaty would mean that the president took a stand which totally differs from that approved by the parliament. The actions by Kravchuk play into the hands of Russia and the United States and were carried out by him under pressure, stated the members of parliament. Many of them say that they will come out against any attempt by President Kravchuk to ignore the reservations which were signed and expressed during the discussion dedicated to the ratification of the START I treaty. The communist deputies speak out for impeaching President Kravchuk if the trilateral Moscow agreement is signed.

Accord Attempt To 'Deceive'

LD1401162294 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 1416 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Kiev—Asked by a UNIAN correspondent today to comment on the documents signed by the Ukrainian, Russian, and U.S. Presidents on removing nuclear weapons from Ukraine to Russia with the aim of dismantling them, Ihor Derkach, people's deputy of Ukraine and a member of the Supreme Council Committee for Defense and State Security Issues, stated: "This is yet another political step by Leonid Kravchuk who is unable to pursue any other policy. I cannot see any security guarantees from Russia and America. This simply is intended to deceive Ukraine with Kravchuk's help. As for the $155 million allocated to Ukraine by Bill Clinton, this is the money that has been paid to American specialists who were on assignment in Ukraine."

Mykola Shulha, chairman of the Supreme Council Committee for Issues of State Sovereignty and Inter-Republican and Inter-ethnic Relations: "If after signing the documents Russia does not comply with the obligations assumed, this could undermine the global authority of such an influential state as America, and would have negative consequences for the whole world. As for the trilateral agreement, I shall endeavour to convince the Supreme Council to ratify this document. I believe that a compromise solution can also be found in settling the issues of the Black Sea Fleet and Sevastopol. Policy should be made through understanding and respect for the interests of our states."

Volodymyr Filenko, people's deputy of Ukraine and chairman of the Party of the Democratic Revival of Ukraine: "I expressed my opinion even before the documents were signed and can confirm that my assessment is positive. First, Ukraine today is economically unable to maintain this nuclear potential. Second, as a result of signing the agreement it will be provided with fuel for its nuclear electric stations, which will partly resolve the energy problem. Third, it will become possible to set up a certain stabilization fund to introduce the hryvnya. However, this is Ukraine's last reserve, and political and economic reforms are now badly needed."

Volodmyr Klymchuk, chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party of Ukraine: "I assess the signing of the Moscow agreement to be a Ukrainian diplomatic success, implementing the Declaration on the Independence of Ukraine. At last its primary provision on non-nuclear status is being realized and Ukraine will receive certain benefits which are badly needed. As for comments to the effect that nuclear weapons will be handed to Zhirinovskiy, I would like to stress that this figure is no doubt dangerous. However, hidden national communists and national fascists are an even greater danger."

Mykhaylo Boychyshyn, chairman of the secretariat of the People's Movement of Ukraine: "What happened in Moscow is a total betrayal of the Ukrainian people, and is bad enough to stand trial for."

Mykola Bahrov, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of the Crimea: "My assessment of the Moscow agreement between Ukraine, the United States, and Russia on the elimination of Ukrainian nuclear weapons is positive. In general, President Leonid Kravchuk's assets are the international recognition of Ukraine. His liabilities are what has happened to the Ukrainian economy."

Deal 'Not Likely' To Be Implemented

LD1601172694 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] The Moscow deal on the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Ukrainian soil is part of "President Kravchuk's defeatist policy," member of the parliamentary commission for defence and security matters Igor Derkach told Interfax on Saturday.

He says the agreement is not likely to be implemented given further economic recession in Ukraine.

Derkach pointed to a lack of convincing arguments in statements by the American and Russian leaders about security guarantees and technical assistance to Ukraine. "The $175 Mn aid to Ukraine the Americans promised a long time ago will be used to pay U.S. experts," he said.

The dismantling and transfer of long-range missiles from Ukraine to Russia will cost $3 Bn, according to the estimates local experts made prior to the ratification of the Start I agreement by Ukrainian deputies.

Rukh Assesses Kravchuk Actions as 'Treachery'

LD1501180794 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1515 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Nekrasova]

[Text] Lvov, 15 Jan—The tripartite treaty on the elimination of nuclear weapons in Ukraine, which has been signed in Moscow, will make it possible to deepen cooperation between Ukraine and other states and will meet with the understanding and support of the world community. This view was expressed today by the

Ukrainian Foreign Minister Konstantin Zlenko [name as received], Defense Minister Vitaliy Radetskyy, and Deputy Prime Minister Vasiliy Shmarov at a meeting with representatives of the diplomatic corps.

At the same time Ukrainian centrist and radical right-wing political parties showed a total lack of understanding of the signing of the treaty. In particular, the very large Rukh organization and the Conservative Republican Party assessed the actions taken by President Kravchuk as treachery. According to them, the document signed in Moscow covers not only liquid fuelled rockets but also solid fuelled ones, which are not even mentioned in the START I Treaty.

The pointer of the political barometer in Ukraine has moved toward tension. The sharp response has been softened to a certain extent by the Christmas holidays, which continue until 19 January.

Ukrainian Nationalists Reject Nuclear Agreement

LD1701111294 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 2219 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Kiev, 16 Jan—Delegates to an all-Ukrainian conference of the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists [KUN] voiced their attitude toward the signing of a trilateral agreement in Moscow on Ukraine's unilateral nuclear disarmament. The fact that the president of Ukraine signed this agreement is regarded by KUN as being counter to Ukraine's national interests. KUN demands that the signed agreement be immediately examined and rejected by the Supreme Council of Ukraine, that the government be banned from taking any action to prepare for its implementation, and that the president of Ukraine be impeached and held liable.

In its election program, KUN will campaign for a clear-cut division of power into legislative, executive, and judicial, for a reform of law-enforcement bodies, dissolution of the Security Service of Ukraine, and the establishment of effective state security services. KUN will campaign for adoption of laws on government and public service with a strict system of accountability for the actions of state institutions. In the economic policy area, KUN will campaign for private ownership, giving priority to agriculture and industry. In the foreign policy area, KUN stands for Ukraine's cooperation with all countries. The Congress [word indistinct] for a non-nuclear Ukraine in a non-nuclear world.

Lvov Council Head Airs Doubts on Nuclear Accord

LD1501173394 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 0820 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] Lvov—Mykola Horyn, Lvov Oblast council chairman and a candidate for people's deputy of Ukraine, said in a conversation with a UNIAN correspondent on 14 January that his stance regarding nuclear weapons differs from the stance of his brothers—Mykhaylo Horyn, chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, and Bohdan Horyn, people's deputy of Ukraine, who are in favor of keeping nuclear weapons on our territory. Mykola Horyn proposed an approach to this issue not from a political, but from a technical and economic aspect, for nuclear weapons have not only to be stored, but properly serviced too.

"These weapons have to be tested. But will Lvov and other oblast councils give permission for underground nuclear explosion tests to be conducted on their territories?" Mykola Horyn posed the question.

National Affairs

Results, Reaction to Crimean Elections Reported

Bahrov, Meshkov To Face Runoff

WS1701102094 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Our listeners are greatly interested in the results of the 16 January presidential election in the Crimea. According to reports from our Simferopol correspondent, out of the six candidates running, no one received the required number of votes for an outright victory. Viktor (Alsufiev), chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, said that the commission will have to discuss a runoff between the two candidates receiving the most votes in yesterday's election. Yuriy Meshkov, leader of the Republican Party of the Crimea, came in first in both Simferopol and Sevastopol, as well as in many rural areas. Yuriy Meshkov received 540,000 votes altogether. The second-place candidate for the presidential office is Mykola Bahrov—chairman of the Crimean Supreme Soviet—who received 245,000 votes. Third place is occupied by Serhey Shuvaynikov, of the Russian Party of the Crimea, who won 186,000 votes. Leonid Hrach, leader of Crimean communists, received some 180,000 votes.

Breakdown of Preliminary Results

LD1701105094 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 2219 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Simferopol, 16 Jan—Violations of the ban on campaigning on 15 and 16 January were observed in some cities, including Sevastopol, Simferopol, and Yalta, the Central Electoral Commission for the Crimean presidential election told UNIAR. These offences were committed by followers of Crimean Republican Party Chairman Yuriy Meshkov, Russian Party of Crimea Chairman Sergey Shuvaynikov and Communist Party Chairman Leonid Hrach.

Forty-eight percent of electors voted by 1200, and 60-70 percent in some cities and villages, primarily in the rural areas of north-western Crimea.

By 1800, 70 percent had voted in Dzhankoy, Feodosiya, Sudak, and Bakhchisaray, 82 percent in Belogorsk

Rayon and 98 percent in Razdolnoye Rayon. A total of 80 percent turned out at the polls.

According to preliminary results received from district electoral commissions in Sevastopol, Simferopol, Yevpatoriya, Kerch, and Feodosiya, Chairman of the Crimean Republican Party Yuriy Meshkov is leading by a quarter of votes. He is followed by [parliament chairman] Mykola Bahrov, Leonid Hrach, and Sergey Shuvaynikov. In Sevastopol, Mykola Bahrov is second, followed by [Ukrainian president's representative Ivan] Yermakov, Shuvaynykov, and Hrach.

Further on Results

PM1701155394 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 94 First Edition p 1

[Nikolay Semena report: "Crimea: Pro-Moscow Candidate Could Become President"]

[Text] Simferopol—Over 80 percent of Crimea's voters took part in the 16 January elections of the republic's first president.

According to the preliminary figures of the Central Electoral Commission, the largest number of votes — around 542,000 or approximately 38.5 percent—went to Yuriy Meshkov, the candidate from the Republican Party of Crimea which belongs to the "Russia" electoral bloc. In second place, with about 17 percent, is Nikolay Bahrov, an independent candidate and chairman of the Supreme Soviet. These two will run in the second round of voting which will be held in two weeks' time—on 30 January.

None of the commentators expected such a success for Yuriy Meshkov. His rating in independent polls varied from 19 to 20 percent, in contrast to which the rating of Leonid Hrach, the Communist Party of Crimea candidate, reached 40 percent whereas in fact he was supported by just 12.5 percent of the voters.

Meshkov, age 48, is a well-known political figure in Crimea. His mother is Ukrainian, his father is Russian. He graduated from Moscow University's Law Faculty. He worked as an investigator and a lawyer. He is a people's deputy and coordinator of the "Republic" deputies' group in the Crimean Supreme Soviet and a founder and chairman of the Republican Movement which later became the Republican Party of Crimea.

The main planks of his election platform are as follows: Lifting the moratorium on the referendum on the status of Crimea, the law on which was adopted by the Crimean parliament on the initiative of and under pressure from Meshkov and his comrades. He believes that the positive results of the referendum and Crimea's acquisition of state independence will make it possible to restore the republic's union with Russia. Meshkov intends to restore Crimea to the ruble area, give the inhabitants of the republic the right to dual citizenship, preserve a free medical service and education, and lead the fight against crime mainly by stepping up the penalties for all offenses. Meshkov advocates Russian status for Sevastopol and abolition of the act of 1954 [which transferred Crimea to the Ukraine]. He believes that the Black Sea Fleet must belong to Russia. Meshkov is against giving the Crimean Tatars a quota of deputies' seats in the future parliament of the autonomous formation.

Sergey Shuvaynikov, the Russian Party candidate supported by Zhirinovskiy, received 13.5 percent.

The results of the first stage of the elections in Crimea will undoubtedly provide food for thought for many people, and not only in Ukraine. Should they be viewed as the Crimeans' desire for a radical change in Crimea's status and state allegiance? Or is this just a protest against the general crisis in society which spontaneously developed into a vote against the man in power who personifies Ukraine more than Crimea itself? Kiev, meanwhile, can use the differences in Crimean and Ukrainian law to declare the elections unlawful and annul the results.

Bahrov Comments on Lead in Poll

LD1701203694 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 1545 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Excerpt] Simferopol, 17 Jan—[passage omitted] The Central Electoral Commission has confirmed the results of the vote and appointed 30 January 1994 for the additional round of Crimean presidential elections, with two candidates, Yuriy Meshkov and Mykola Bahrov, included in the ballot paper.

In an exclusive interview with a UNIAN correspondent, Yuriy Meshkov, in the lead in the presidential race, said he would have won the first round of elections had it not been for a split in the Russian movement blamed on Serhiy Shuvaynykov, who had refused to withdraw his candidacy.

As for the probability of his victory in the second round of elections, the RPK-RDK [Republican Party of the Crimea-Party of the Republican Movement of the Crimea] leader did not deny rumors of a possible transfer in his favor of votes in support of Serhiy Shuvaynykov. In the elections Shuvaynykov had the backing of the LDPR [Liberal Democratic Party of Russia], Zhirinovskiy, and those in favor of the communist Leonid Hrach. Meshkov did not rule that it was possible those in power would obstruct the holding of the second round of the elections.

Also in an exclusive interview with a UNIAN correspondent on the eve of the elections, Yuriy Meshkov stated he was convinced that in the event of his election he would be able to avert a conflict with the Ukrainian leadership. At a meeting with representatives of political parties in December, in his words, Leonid Kravchuk did not oppose holding the elections of the Crimean president (UNIAN has it that Leonid Kravchuk only said it was unreasonable to counteract it). In Yuriy Meshkov's view,

there is a legitimate basis for relations between Ukraine and the Crimea, as well as those between Russia and the Crimea, to be settled legally. He evaded a straight answer to the question on whether his victory would ensure the participation of Crimean districts in the elections to the Ukrainian Supreme Council in March, which are to be with elections to the Crimean Supreme Council. The RDK leader stated that all-Ukrainian elections could only be held on condition they would not contravene the interests of the Crimea and that he would not take a decision on that issue on his own. He did not, however, specify what these interests exactly were as seen by him.

Yuriy Meshkov is 45 years old. He is Russian. He chairs the Republican Party of the Crimea-Party of the Republican Movement of the Crimea and is a people's deputy of the Crimea. He graduated from the law department at the Moscow State University, is married and has two children. The planks of his pre-election campaign were the full state independence of Crimea and a referendum on this issue; the accession of the Crimea to Russia; his negative attitude toward quotas for participation in the Crimea's elected bodies being granted to deported peoples; and on land being unavailable for private property. [passage omitted]

Crimean Tartar Majlis Chairman Mustafa Dzemilev on his part stated in an interview with a UNIAN correspondent that if Yuriy Meshkov was to be elected to the post of the Crimean president, then "given his overt program of having the Crimea quit Ukraine, we shall regard him solely as a president of his voters but in no way as that of the Crimean Tartar people".

RPK Deputy Allays Fears

LD1701230594 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 2147 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Simferopol, 17 Jan—A UNIAR correspondent has been told by Borys Kyrylov, Crimean Supreme Council people's deputy and member of the Coordination Council of the Republican Party of Crimea [RPK], that the RPK leader's victory in the elections is a surprise for the party. If any, a referendum on the status of the peninsula, in Kyrylov's view, will only be of a consultative nature and there is no threat to the integrity of Ukraine whatsoever.

According to that party's decisions and in order to deprive the Crimean president of the executive functions of the head of government, changes and amendments to the Law on the president of the Crimea will be introduced if Yuriy Meshkov scores a victory.

Kravchuk Fires Yermakov

LD1701150094 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1417 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Excerpts] There was quite a high turnout in the elections for president of the republic on 16 January. [passage omitted]

INTERFAX reports that Ivan Yermakov, the Ukrainian president's representative in Sevastopol, has been relieved of his duties. Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk signed the relevant instruction on 17 January.

Local observers think this is the Ukrainian leadership's first reaction to the results of the presidential elections in Crimea, and do not rule out that other actions might follow this dismissal.

Returns Being Examined

LD1701193294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1807 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] The head of the presidential public relations office, Nikolay Mikhalchenko, told INTERFAX-Ukraine today that "the returns of the recent elections in the Crimea were being examined." He added that "specific decisions will be made in accordance with the Constitution of Ukraine" in the near future.

Mikhalchenko pointed out that the Ukrainian Constitution never envisioned presidential elections in the Crimea. He also said Ukrainian Speaker Ivan Plyushch had warned the Crimean parliament of the impossibility of holding such elections before.

The Ukrainian president's press office is expected to come out with a statement on the issue in a day or two.

As a result of the first round of the presidential elections in the Crimea on January 16, the leader of the Republican Party of the Crimea, Yuriy Meshkov, led the race with 38.8 percent of the electorate. He is widely known as a supporter of the Crimea's unification with Russia.

Ukrainian patriotic forces will never recognize the legality of the presidential elections in the Crimea, according to the statement the leader of the Civic Congress of the Crimea, Sergey Litvinov, made in an interview with INTERFAX-Ukraine.

At the same time, he admitted that the Crimean elections were a fiasco of nationalist movements whose popularity on the peninsula is very low.

In his opinion, this is a result of the Ukrainian leadership's imprudent policy which left Crimean Ukrainians with no support.

A deputy of the Ukrainian parliament and one of the leaders of the nationalist movement "Rukh," Les Tanyuk, commented on the election returns by saying that their main result was the failure of Kravchuk's team.

"People voted not against Nikolay Bahrov (Speaker of the Ukrainian parliament—INTERFAX) as a politician, but rather against Bahrov as Kravchuk's representative," he told INTERFAX-Ukraine.

He put all the blame for this on the Ukrainian president who failed to promptly stand up against the illegal elections as a guarantor of the Constitution.

Tanyuk said Yuriy Meshkov promised easy ways out of simple situations and in this sense he was one of Zhirinovskiy's men to a great extent.

The repercussions of the elections may be very dangerous and disastrous both for Ukraine and Russia, as well as for the whole of Europe, Tanyuk said.

Deputy: Elections Unconstitutional

LD1801111494 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0800 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] On Monday [17 January], [Supreme Council Deputy] Mykola Porovskyy, committee chairman of the organization Crimea With Ukraine, said: I believe the presidential elections in Crimea run counter to the Ukrainian constitution. He said that the future course of events in Crimea can develop into a conflict. It is crucial, he said, to take necessary measures to prevent destabilizing processes in Crimea.

Two candidates, Yuriy Meshkov and Mykola Bahrov will compete against each other in a runoff on 30 January.

Crimean Parties Form Bloc Against Governing Party

LD1401154394 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 0800 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Simferopol—A news conference of representatives of parties of the Crimea, which have set up an anti-authority interparty coalition bloc of opposition forces, took place on 13 January. The Union in Support of the Republic of the Crimea [Soyuz za Pidtrymku Respubliky Krym], the Communist Party of the Crimea, the Republican Party of the Crimea, and the People's Party of the Crimea [Narodna Partiya Krymu] are part of it. The initiators of setting up the bloc have stated that it is not ruled out that other parties and organizations of the republic will join it too. Yuriy Komov [name as received], a member of the political council of the Union in Support of the Republic of the Crimea and people's deputy of the Crimea, has stated that the association's main task is to act as a united front against the current "party of power" in the Crimea and Mykola Bahrov, its leader. "We are not rejecting Bahrov as a person," Yuriy Komov emphasized, "but the policy that he is conducting on the principle 'divide and rule'—a policy of advancing on people's backs." In their speeches the leaders of parties accused the speaker of betraying the interests of the (Communist) party and of plagiarism ("he has collected in his program the cream of the election programs of his rivals"); the opinion was expressed that Mykola Bahrov bears personal responsibility for the poverty-stricken economic state of the Crimea.

Fedir Volchan [name as received], a member of the republican committee of the People's Party of the Crimea, noted that the bloc that has been set up is not a provisional attempt, but an attempt calculated for the future to shape relations between the parties of the Crimea after the elections. In his opinion, the actions of the government and the Central Electoral Commission, which has become Bahrov's "doormat" during preparations for elections of the president of the Crimea, indicate their readiness to agree to falsifying the voting results.

Shots Fired at Communist Party Headquarters

PM1401145594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jan 94 First Edition p 3

[Nikolay Semena report: "Election Battle in the Crimea: One Candidate Targeted, Another Has Gone Underground"]

[Text] Simferopol—Several shots, presumably from a rifle, were fired at the building of the Communist Party of Crimea Republic Committee in Simferopol 12 January.

One bullet pierced the glass of a window in the office of Leonid Hrach, republic committee first secretary and candidate for Crimean president. Fortunately, at the time the office's usual occupant was in a carefully guarded republic radio studio, where a live debate between the presidential candidates was in progress. There were 15 minutes to go until the end of the discussion....

An incident of a different kind took place around another candidate—Supreme Soviet Chairman Nikolay Bargov. As he was coming of a hall in Yalta after addressing voters, a group of women expressed their dislike of the candidate by attempting to strike him. The security services came to the rescue.

The Crimean presidential elections are scheduled for 16 January. Six candidates have registered, all of whom are now vigorously campaigning.

Crimea's law on the presidential elections prohibits local mass media sources from publishing candidates' popularity ratings, although the results of independent studies, which coincide in many ways, are passed around from hand to hand and by word of mouth. All observers note that the main rivalry has developed between the two candidates with the highest chances of victory. That is, current Crimean Supreme Soviet Chairman Nikolay Bahrov and Communist Party Leader Leonid Hrach. Both are experienced politicians—however, at times their electoral platforms are diametrically opposed. Leonid Hrach is supported by structures of the renewed Communist Party, and Nikolay Bahrov, although registered as an independent candidate, is also supported by influential political forces like the Party for the Economic Revival of Crimea, the Agrarian Party, the Party of Interethnic Accord, and the Party of Social Guarantees.

Again, Bahrov's side is taken by the Crimean Tatar People's Assembly, which adopted a decision to participate in the elections. As Assembly Chairman Mustafa Dzhemilev [name as transliterated] told IZVESTIYA's correspondent, the Assembly members analyzed all the candidates' speeches and programs and watched the exclusive interview with Nikolay Bahrov on the Crimean Tatar television program "Ana Yurt" [as transliterated]. It was noted that all candidates apart from him are calling for measures which will lead to a revision of borders, and this means conflict in the Crimea. Therefore, the Assembly has urged compatriots to vote against all candidates except Bahrov.

As election day draws nearer, political tension in the Crimea grows. Cities are covered with leaflets. Every weekend there are several meetings, congresses, and rallies.

Vladimir Zhirinovskiy brought some quite unexpected tones to the political battle between contenders for the presidency. He decided to help one of the candidates, and appealed to the people of the Crimea: "The LDPR [Liberal Democratic Party of Russia] considers the Russian Party of the Crimea [RPC] (leader, S. Shuvaynikov) to be the only party in the Crimea capable of defending the interests of Crimean or Russian people. Remember, the LDPR will be with the RPC in fighting for your rights. We will defend Russian people, wherever they may be."

Vladimir Volfovich's appeal proves that the Crimean party's patron is simply out of touch. In fact, a scandal had occurred in the Russian Party the day before: Sergey Shuvaynikov refused to stand down in favor of a candidate from the "Russia" bloc and even spoke out against joining the bloc itself. Furthermore, he gathered together likeminded thinkers and they excluded those behind the idea for an electoral bloc from the Russian Party. In response, supporters of the bloc assembled their own confederation and excluded the chairman himself from the Russian Party—that is, their own presidential candidate Sergey Shuvaynikov, who, incidentally, has already succeeded in proclaiming himself the Crimea's shadow prime minister. There was a positively savage attack on Anatoliy Los, leader of the Russian Society of the Crimea and the most fervent supporter of the electoral bloc. Medics at the hospital gave him 30 stitches, while Shuvaynikov, who stands accused of this terrorist act, issued his own statement on television, where he announced that he is "switching to an unofficial position" and requested protection from the security services and the prosecutor's office.

Communist Party Statement

LD1401184694 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] The ruling body of the Crimean Communist Party made public a statement Friday saying that the assassination attempt against party leader Leonid Hrach was designed "to frighten the presidential candidate" and foil the presidential elections.

Shots were fired on January 12 at the windows of Hrach's office. One of the party officials was sitting in Hrach's armchair at that time. By the latest reports, the bullets pierced the table but did not hit the official.

The statement expressed its willingness to set up workers' self-defense units which would "within the framework of the law fight organized crime and stop the Mafia."

The Crimean Interior Ministry's press service says, meanwhile, that the incident was an act of hooliganism rather than an assassination attempt.

Belarus

U.S.-Belarusian Documents Signed Before Clinton Visit

LD1401175594 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1650 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By BELINFORM-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyushkevich]

[Text] Minsk, 14 Jan—Within the framework of U.S. President Bill Clinton's upcoming visit to the republic, a number of Belarusian-U.S. agreements was signed at the Belarusian Foreign Ministry today. The agreements were signed by Foreign Minister Petr Kravchenko, and David Swartz, the U.S. ambassador to Belarus.

The signed documents include an agreement between the United States and Belarusian Governments on scientific and technical cooperation, exchange letters to the treaty between the Republic of Belarus and the United States on encouraging and mutually protecting investments, a general agreement on promoting projects between the Finance Ministry and the National Bank of the Republic of Belarus and the U.S. Export-Import Bank, as well as a memorandum on mutual understanding between the U.S. Government and the government of the Republic of Belarus regarding the intent to sign an agreement on setting up a joint commission for agro-business and rural development.

Also, the Belarusian Foreign Ministry and the U.S. Embassy exchanged notes on the Republic of Belarus' application of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on cooperation between customs.

Clinton Discusses Cooperation With Officials

LD1501135994 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1300 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] Minsk, 15 Jan (BELINFORM-TASS)—Prospects for political and economic cooperation in the future and the withdrawal of strategic nuclear forces from the republic's territory were discussed during the talks with Bill Clinton. The head of the Belarusian Parliament thanked the U.S. President for his great personal contribution to the protection of human rights and highly assessed the Partnership for Peace cooperation program proposed by Bill Clinton.

Speaking about the situation in the republic, Stanislav Shushkevich said he is advocating a democratic development of the state, early elections of supreme legislative bodies, and economic reforms. He expressed hope that the new constitution—the Supreme Soviet is to consider it at its current session—will assist in this.

Bill Clinton, in his turn, said the United States wants to support democratic processes which are under way in the Republic of Belarus, and is ready to provide technical aid in holding early elections. Bill Clinton said the United States is allocating an additional $25 million in order to implement the process of withdrawing the strategic nuclear forces from Belarusian territory. He also said that an American business center will be opened in Minsk, possibly in the next two months.

The Treaty on Encouragement and Mutual Protection of Investments between the Republic of Belarus and the United States, signed today by Stanislav Shushkevich and Bill Clinton, will help to develop economic cooperation between the two countries.

Cooperation Documents Signed

LD1501151194 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1449 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk January 15 TASS—A memorandum on mutual understanding, which expresses the intention to create a Belarusian-U.S. commission on agricultural businesses and development of rural areas was signed here today during the Minsk stay of U.S. President Bill Clinton. The U.S. President voiced the availability of additional credits for Belarusian purchases of U.S. foodstuffs.

Shushkevich and Clinton are satisfied with a bilateral agreement on science and technology which provides for quick expansion of scientific information exchange and joint R&D.

An agreement to continue the elaboration of documents against double taxation and on cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy has been reached as well.

Bill Clinton told the Belarusian leader they will pass over to Belarus ten million dollars worth of medical equipment.

The sides discussed prospects for democratic reforms in Belarus and parliamentary elections. Clinton expressed the hope the elections will be held in 1994 and promised technical assistance to their organization.

The leaders voiced their support to international efforts for settlement of international conflicts, consolidation of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, including new independent nations of the former Soviet Union.

The Belarusian parliament speaker and the U.S. President noted recent progress in overcoming the division of the European continent and outlining ways towards more close cooperation between states. President Clinton dwelt on his initiative Partnership for Peace, and Shushkevich assured the President Belarus will thoroughly analyze a possibility of their participation in the initiative.

Shushkevich and Clinton expressed common opinion the Belarusian visit of the U.S. President made a weighty contribution to consolidation of bilateral friendship, cooperation and mutual understanding.

President Clinton expressed profound gratitude to the Belarusian Supreme Soviet, government and people for warm reception of his family, the U.S. delegation and himself.

Joint Statement Signed

LD1501144694 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1436 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk January 15 TASS—A joint statement on results of Belarusian-U.S. summit negotiations was signed today to express satisfaction of the sides with the expansion of bilateral contacts and outline measures for cooperation in security, trade, investments, non-proliferation of nuclear arms, science and technology.

The sides noted historic Belarusian steps to fulfill its obligations as a non-nuclear state. The Belarusian leader informed Bill Clinton of implementation of the Belarusian nuclear disarmament program.

In his turn, Clinton confirmed high U.S. estimation of the Belarusian role in the vitally important sphere and assured Shushkevich of further U.S. support to these efforts. He said about the additional 25 million dollars to be used for dismantling nuclear arms within the framework of the Nunn-Lugar Law, which increases the overall sum allocated for the effect to 100 millions.

Bill Clinton told Stanislav Shushkevich about the tripartite statement of U.S., Russian and Ukrainian Presidents of January 14, 1994, and voiced U.S. recognition of the importance of just compensation to Belarus of the cost of enriched uranium from nuclear warheads that were located on its territory.

The leaders confirmed U.S. and Belarusian adherence to non-proliferation of nuclear arms and took an obligation of close cooperation in the sphere.

Shushkevich informed the U.S. President of Belarusian economic and democratic reforms and confirmed the course towards accelerated privatization of state enterprises. Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Shushkevich [name and title as received] told the U.S. President about Belarusian Government efforts to ensure transition to market relations and transformation of credit-monetary, banking and other economic spheres. Kebich and Clinton exchanged opinion on bilateral economic relations.

The U.S. President announced a new package of technical assistance to Belarus to help the financing of privatization of small ventures, training of personnel, health care and ecological projects. The President supported accelerated economic reform in Belarus.

Shushkevich and Clinton signed a treaty on investments and expressed the assurance the expansion of trade relations will be economically beneficial for both states and serve as an incentive for development of private enterprise in Belarus. A bilateral agreement to enable the U.S. Export-Import Bank to expand its operations on financing bilateral trade was also announced.

The sides exchanged notes to put into effect the agreement on mutual assistance of their customs services.

Meets Opposition Leaders

LD1501150894 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1455 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk January 15 TASS—Upon the completion of his negotiations with Belarusian Leader Stanislav Shushkevich and Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich, U.S. President Bill Clinton met representatives of Belarusian opposition parties and movements.

The meeting was attended by leader of the Belarusian National Front Zenon P nyak and Chairman of the Belarusian United Dem cratic Party Aleksandr Dobrovolskiy.

Visits Kuropaty, Leaves for Airport

LD1501164494 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1559 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk January 15 TASS—U.S. President Bill Clinton, currently here on an official stay, visited Kuropaty, the burial place of Stalin repressions' victims, this afternoon.

The president lit a candle and inclined his head in a minute of silence near the memorable cross. Bill Clinton left a symbolic memorial sign in Kuropaty to read in Belarussian and English "from the people of the United States of America to the people of Belarus. January 15, 1994".

The President was accompanied by Belarussian leader Stanislav Shushkevich.

He left Kuropaty for the airport to depart for Geneva after meeting staffers of the U.S. Embassy.

Completes Official Visit

LD1501174894 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1703 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk January 15 TASS—U.S. President Bill Clinton completed his official Belarusian visit tonight and left for Geneva. At the Minsk-2 airport he was seen off by Belarusian leader Stanislav Shushkevich.

Right upon his arrival from the airport Stanislav Shushkevich gave a news conference for Belarusian and foreign correspondents who covered the visit of Bill Clinton.

Kravchenko on Hopes for Uranium Compensation

LD1501183794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1626 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] In his interview with Interfax on Saturday head of Belarus' Foreign Ministry Petr Kravchenko declared that Belarus hopes to solve the issue on a just monetary compensation for uranium to be extracted from nuclear warheads, which Russia intends to sell to America, during U.S. President Bill Clinton's visit to Minsk.

He explained that "in contrast to Ukraine, Belarus does not claim for low enriched uranium which is used as fuel for atomic power stations. We have no nuclear reactors and power plants. Belarus pretends for monetary compensation for this uranium—he underlined—the American party has given its backing to this approach and President Clinton will fix it legally."

In Kravchenko's words, the draft of a corresponding agreement which is expected to be signed on Saturday in Minsk stipulates that "Russia will not be able to sell low enriched uranium to the United States without preliminary coordination with Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan," said Kravchenko.

According to the minister, the visit of the American president to Minsk is a historic event. "The visit has broken Belarus' obscurity in the world once and for ever. From now on Belarus has a chance to be represented in the world as a small democratic civilized state with its deep national traditions," he said.

Kravchenko believes that the Belarusian-American summit "helps to correct the disbalance which has been in our bilateral relations." "Earlier cooperation between two countries was restricted to military strategic problems and problems of refugees," he said.

The minister stressed the importance of the treaty on security of American investments in the Belarusian economy which is to be signed in the course of Clinton's visit to Minsk.

According to the republican Foreign Ministry, in 1993 the volume of turnover between Belarus and United States was $125 Mn. "In 1994 this number will increase by 10 times after signing of the treaty," believes the minister.

He reminded that in February 1993 Belarus was granted the most favored nation regime in trade with the United States. "It means that tariffs higher than common ones will not be imposed on deliveries of Belarusian goods to the United States. In addition, in some cases Belarusian goods will be entirely relieved of any customs tariffs," indicated Kravchenko.

In his words, Belarus hopes to receive an assistance from the United States totalling "several tens of million dollars in addition to those $76 [figure as received] as it has already received according to the Nunn-Lugar law." "This funds will be channelled to prevent transportation of contraband uranium from Russia to the Western Europe by transit via Belarus and to solve export problems and to re-train retired officers," he said.

Shushkevich, Kebich Discuss Clinton Visit

LD1601162894 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 1300 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Excerpts] After the end of the visit by U.S. President Bill Clinton to the Republic of Belarus, the government delegation headed by Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich, and the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus, Vyacheslav Kebich, held a news conference for republican and foreign journalists. In this news bulletin we present a report on this event.

[Begin recording] [Shushkevich] Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased with the results of the visit. [passage omitted]

[K[illegible]ich, in Russian] I should like to say that the government took an active part in setting up the program of the visit, and this question was agreed upon personally between Stanislav Stanislavavich [Shushkevich] and me. The government commission was headed by Mikalay Dzmitryevich Myasnikovich—he is here—and the visit was well organized. We discussed many topics. [passage omitted] [indistinct passage]

[Shushkevich, in Russian] First of all, I want to note that the question of compensation for the (?fissionable) material being removed was raised during the talks for a third time. We received an assurance during the talks with Senators Lugar and Nunn, then in talks with Mr. Christopher. Today the position was categorically confirmed by the U.S. side. This position was agreed upon with Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. We, and the U.S. side, raised the question many times. So, now it is a question of formulating specific accords.

Now I would like to tell the esteemed correspondent: The question should not be asked as to whether the positions were agreed upon between the government and the Supreme Soviet at the talks. That is an incorrect way of putting the question, because we were one and the same [word indistinct], we have no differences of view when it is a matter of the interests of the Republic of Belarus. There is no difference, there never was and never will be, because it is senseless and useless. [passage omitted elaborating on this; Kebich agreeing with him]

[Kebich, in Russian] I can just add to what Stanislav Stanislavavich said, that before the visit of Mr. Clinton I received a letter from Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin, saying that Russia will take part in payment of this sum from the sale of the uranium belonging to the Republic of Belarus. But as for this sum, I do not want to name it—this sum is subject to an agreement, but I want to say that this sum will be sufficiently large to support the economic condition of our republic. To put it briefly, it will be equal to the equivalent of the nuclear weaponry being removed. [passage indistinct]

[Kebich, in Russian] We have an interest in strengthening interaction with NATO countries. We absolutely exclude the possibility of political interference in our internal affairs, and therefore, we have a very correct approach to those specific proposals that are due to be included in the declaration, as you understand, and in order to express our attitude to Partnership for Peace with the NATO countries, we must conclude a declaration with NATO, and in this declaration there must be a certain number of articles. There is a proposal from the Defense Ministry on this issue, but we specifically did not bring them into our negotiations. I think that this a subject for discussion in parliamentary commissions and in the government. We are working out our attitude to this matter.

[Shushkevich, in Russian] We did not bring in these questions, since I knew that these questions of (?foreign) policy activity are questions that are in the competence of the Supreme Soviet. [passage indistinct]

[Shushkevich, in Belarusian] Bill Clinton made a good statement at the beginning our talks, that he would not want in any way to give us advice how to act here in Belarus in solving the main political questions. And I am grateful to him for this. [passage omitted] [end recording]

U.S. Allots $100 Million for Disarmament

WS1701091694 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0800 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Belarus, which U.S. President Bill Clinton has just visited, will receive about $100 million from the U.S. Administration for dismantling its nuclear weapons. The consent of Belarus to destroy its nuclear weapons was highly appreciated by the United States.

Shushkevich on Gaydar Remarks on Monetary Union

LD1601231294 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2200 GMT 16 Jan 94

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Yegor Gaydar said that one of the reasons for his resignation was the inter-bank agreement on unification of the monetary systems of Russia and Belarus. Concerning this, Stanislav Shushkevich, head of the Belarusian Parliament, expressed to INTERFAX the supposition that Gaydar had not been presented with an analysis of Belarus's expenditure on elimination of the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident, on which the republic annually spends 15 percent of its annual budget.

Minsk believes that Russia should take into consideration the factor of the Chernobyl tragedy in the talks on creating a monetary union with Belarus.

Kebich Views Monetary Union

LD1701193194 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1908 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Minsk January 17 TASS—The merger of the monetary systems of Belarus and Russia "will not seriously affect the rouble," Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich said.

In an interview with the news agency BELINFORM, Kebich said that "on the contrary, (Belarus's) more modern fixed assets than in Russia, highly skilled labour, and well developed transportation and industrial infrastructure will ensure that the merger of the two monetary systems will become a long-term condition of the stabilisation of the common currency."

The announcement followed a statement by former Russian Deputy Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar that the merger of the two systems is detrimental to Russia.

Kebich believes that the dispute is caused by "the very monetary approach towards complex economic processes in the economy of the transitional period. Certain circles are tossing up an idea that only a monetary system can affect the economy, while ignoring other factors which are equally important."

Speaking about inflation in Belarus, Kebich stressed that the devaluation of the Belarusian coupons is partly caused by the huge debts of Russian consumers to Belarusian enterprises, as well as by a big discrepancy between energy prices in the two republics.

Earlier today Belarusian First Vice-Prime Minister Mikhail Myasnikovich said that the merger of the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems is beneficial to both republics.

The Belarusian vice-premier said that Belarus is doing everything possible to agree the tax, banking, customs and foreign economic policies. The talks on these issues were in progress during the entire last year. On many of them agreements have been reached. "We are working within the framework of an agreed tax, licence and quota policy," Myasnikovich said.

He stressed that the merger of the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems aims at removing barriers in trade and monetary cooperation that emerged after Russia seceded from the rouble zone, starting the chaotic development of independent monetary policies in CIS states.

In a joint statement signed on January 5, the heads of government of Russia and Belarus stated that the necessary preliminary work for merging the two monetary systems has been completed.

Myasnikovich on Monetary Merger

LD1701161294 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1557 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Minsk January 17 TASS—Belarusian First Vice-Prime Minister Mikhail Myasnikovich said on Monday that the merger of the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems is beneficial to both republics.

The announcement followed a statement by former Russian Vice-Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar that the merger of the two systems is detrimental to Russia.

Myasnikovich said that "the statement by Yegor Timurovich reflects the position not of the whole government of Russia, but of one of its members, though very influential."

Myasnikovich stressed that during the talks in Moscow on January 5 with Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich, Gaydar did not rule out the possibility of the integration of the two monetary systems. He said, however, that this is a long process and may take up to six months.

The Belarusian vice-premier said that Belarus is doing everything possible to agree the tax, banking, customs and foreign economic policies. The talks on these issues were in progress during the entire last year. On many of them agreements have been reached. "We are working within the framework of an agreed tax, licence and quota policy," Myasnikovich said.

He stressed that the merger of the Russian and Belarusian monetary systems aims at removing barriers in trade and monetary cooperation that emerged after Russia seceded from the rouble zone, starting the chaotic development of independent monetary policies in CIS states.

In a joint statement signed on January 5, the heads of government of Russia and Belarus stated that the necessary preliminary work for merging the two monetary systems has been completed.

Moldova

Commander Denies 14th Army on Alert in Dniester

LD1701180994 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1704 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS freelance correspondent Anatoliy Kholodnik]

[Text] Tiraspol, 17 Jan—The press service of the Russian 14th Army issued a statement today condemning attempts to set the population of the Dniester Republic against servicemen. Someone thinks it very important to drive a wedge between the Army and the population, to make the Army a scapegoat for all evils, and thereby to divert public attention from the sociopolitical problems that really do exist in the Dniester Republic, the statement says.

Explaining this statement to the ITAR-TASS correspondent, General Lebed, commander of the 14th Army, pointed to unscrupulous articles in a number of newspapers, in particular PRAVDA, alleging that the Army had been put on combat alert and was preparing an assault on the Dniester Republic government.

Russian Army Commander Denies Plotting Coup

LD1501194394 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1457 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] In Tiraspol (an administrative center of Transdniester) there have appeared anonymous leaflets accusing the commander of the 14th Russian Army, Lieutenant-General Aleksandr Lebed of plotting a coup d'etat to overthrow the authorities of the self-proclaimed Transdniestrian Moldovan Republic.

The leaflets say that the plot was masterminded by the leader of the Russian Party of the Economic Freedom Konstantin Borovoy and the leader of the Party's local branch, businessman Sergey Manukyan.

Speaking over the Tiraspol cable TV "Asket," Lebed described the leaflets as sheer nonsense. He said, though, that the Transdniestrian leaders involved in what he said machinations and corruption and cheating the ordinary people, are trying to shift the blame for their mistakes and the deteriorating economic situation in the region on the Russian military. The commander has said that he was prepared to prove this and cooperate in this respect with other bodies to establish the truth.

Observers believe the authorship of leaflets belongs to the Transdniestrian Security Ministry, whose leader Vadim Shevtsov-Antyufeyev is in constant conflict with Aleksandr Lebed.

Addressing last Tuesday the Tiraspol parliament, he accused in public the Russian general of plotting a coup.

Commenting in an interview with Interfax on the fact of the leaflets appearance, the speaker of the Transdniestrian parliament Grigoriy Marakutsa has said that he ordered to conduct investigation into the case and establish real authors of the leaflets.

Former Minister Discusses Russian Army Presence

AU1601173194 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 2024 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS, 16/1/1994—No serious politician makes any illusions on the term for Russian factor to stay in Dniester, states retired Colonel Anatol

Plugaru, former national security minister, to the magazine SAPTAMANA [THE WEEK]. "Russia's Army will walk out when we become not interesting for Russia or other states that it cannot ignore will dictate it. Until then, Moldova and Russia, for their citizens' life, have to find an acceptable variant for both parties" Plugaru believes. Asked about the information saying that the National Security Minister is involved in the activity of the Ilascu Group, Plugaru said "we supported only those forces which acted according to Moldovan legislation. Therefore, I think that if someone infringed it, he should be made responsible basing on this legislation." The ex-minister spoke about various forms of people's fight against Dniester regime, including partisans. The National Security Ministry has done its best to support all forces that pleaded for territorial integrity of Moldova. If he did not do so, the ministry should have been dissolved and its employees sued for criminal passivity, states the quoted source. Asked about the assertion that Ilie Ilascu's arrest was organized by the National Security Ministry, Plugaru said: "We must understand the condition of a man sentenced to death" but still "we should examine much seriously this declaration of Ilascu, since it should worry us." Neither Ilascu nor his comrades have done anything against Moldova's Penal Code. Three years ago, the new state formation, that is the Republic of Moldova, "was unable as it is now to make order without bloodshed" on territories where certain forces speculating with Romanophobia and difficulties of republican power have took the power and declared their own republics, ex-USSR's interests on this territory were also menaced. Russia has never before had such a rude attitude towards the people of this land. "It is an illusion that somebody can win in this situation." Russia must pay for its presence here, and not raise prices for gasoline and energy, says Plugaru.

Tajikistan

Deputy Defense Minister Wounded, Driver Killed

LD1801112194 Dushanbe Radio Tajikistan Network in Russian 1000 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] The car of Colonel Nurali Sheraliyev, deputy defense minister of the republic, was fire upon by unknown gunmen yesterday evening.

Sheraliyev was returning to Dushanbe from the town of Nurek [80km south-east of Dushanbe].

The driver was killed and Colonel Sheraliyev and another person in the car were wounded as a result of the armed attack which took place between the towns of Nurek and Kofarnihon [25km south-east of Dushanbe].

The competent bodies have begun an investigation of the case. This was told to a correspondent of Khovar news agency by the reliable sources.

'Intensive' Mortar Attack on Afghan Border Post

LD1601073394 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0653 GMT 16 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Gridneva]

[Text] Dushanbe, 16 Jan—An ITAR-TASS correspondent at the headquarters of the command of the Russian border troops in Tajikistan was informed today that one of the border posts of the Gandyshskiy border detachment came under intensive mortar fire yesterday evening.

More than 20 mortars were launched along the stretch of the border with Afghanistan, some of which exploded right in the outskirts of the Ayvadzh border settlement. Russian border guards neutralized the enemy's weapon emplacements with powerful artillery fire. There were no casualties among border guards and local civilians.

On the same day, Tajik opposition fighters fired from the territory of Afghanistan at a sector controlled by border guards from the Moskovskiy border unit. The Russian border guards neutralized the firing points of the mojahedin with answering fire.

At Least 10 Killed

LD1701093194 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0813 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Dushanbe January 17 TIA-KHOVAR-TASS—At least ten armed transgressors were killed in a clash on the Tajik-Afghan border this past Sunday when an armed anti-government group of more than twenty militants attempted to cross the border from Afghanistan into Tajikistan.

An Uzbek battalion of the CIS collective peacekeeping force helped the Russian borderguards repel the transgressors who retreated to Afghanistan.

None of the CIS and Russian servicemen was hurt.

Turkmenistan

Niyazov Wins Further Term After Referendum

LD1501190494 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1457 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] A national referendum is under way in Turkmenistan to reveal the public view on the parliament's recent decision to keep the incumbent president Saparmurad Niyazov for the second five-year term without elections.

As the Vice-Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission in Turkmenistan Alexander Dodonov has told Interfax, the referendum can be regarded as valid since by 10:00 local time more than 76% of the electorate cast their ballots. By preliminary returns from the commission, of the 1.95 Mn registered constituents, 1.93 Mn (98.9%) voted by noon local time.

Although the final returns won't be known until Sunday's morning, even today it's clear that President Niyazov will stay in office for the next five years.

Receives Over 99 Percent

LD1601092294 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0715 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] The final results have been compiled for the 15 January nationwide referendum in Turkmenistan. Live on the air, here is our Ashgabat correspondent, Merdyen Amanov:

[Amanov] I think that Mayak listeners will be interested to hear the results of the nationwide referendum held yesterday on whether to extend the tenure of office of Saparmurad Niyazov for a second five-year term. Literally an hour ago the Central Electoral Commission completed its work and Turkmenistan will not now be holding its next presidential elections.

The final results of the referendum are as follows: The number of people who received voting slips was 1,959,637. Turnout was 99.99 percent of the electorate, and 99.99 percent of those who voted were in favor of extending the term in office of President Niyazov. The vote against was 212 people, which comes to 0.01 percent.

Elected National Council Chairman

LD1701171794 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1654 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Glazovskaya]

[Text] Ashgabat, 17 Jan—The first congress of the National Revival Movement, which took place in Ashgabat today, ended with the setting up of a National Council. The National Council will unite the activities of public organizations in Turkmenistan, directing its

efforts toward reviving the spiritual and moral values of the Turkmen people. President Saparmurad Niyazov of Turkmenistan was elected chairman of the National Council.

Niyazov Reassures Russian-Speaking Population

LD1701173794 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1705 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Glazovskaya]

[Text] Ashgabat, 17 Jan—Whoever we may be by blood, we are all brothers in spirit, brothers in our purpose—it was with these words that President Saparmurad Niyazov of Turkmenistan addressed the Russian-speaking population of Turkmenistan today.

Speaking at the congress of the National Revival Movement, the head of state assured the Russian-speaking population that in the state he heads, there will be no infringement of their civil rights, nor of the national feelings of all those for whom Turkmenistan has become the motherland. From the lofty tribune of the congress, the president declared that the state and the government guarantee equal democratic rights to all their citizens—regardless of nationality. He pointed out the importance of the Turkmen-Russian agreement on dual nationality, which was signed recently, stressing its role in further strengthening peace, stability, and national accord in Turkmenistan.

Armenia

Decree Orders Reshuffle of Security Agencies

LD1501123994 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1228 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan security agencies will be reshuffled to better respond to their new goals, having emerged since Armenia acquired independence. These goals radically differ from those pursued in the totalitarian period, according to a decree by Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, released here today.

The decree liquidates the so-called "operational services" of Armenia's State Office for National Security which were formerly engaged in ideological control over the population. Their staff will be paid salaries during next three months, after which period they will either be fired or fill other positions in the state office departments, according to results of professional fitness tests. All security personnel are subject to these tests, the decree says.

New guidelines for the State Office for National Security will be developed, along with a new structure of the agency.

Under the decree, the main border-guard administration, agencies in charge of guarding strategically important enterprises, financial and medical departments of the state security office, as well as its technical maintenance services will keep functioning until the complete restructuring will take place. Possibly, they will form the foundation for Armenia's future security service.

David Shakhnazaryan, 39, who since March 1993 was an ambassador at large under the Armenian president, has been appointed an acting head of the State Office for National Security. He is to replace Eduard Simonyants, who headed the office since February 1993 and now will fill another post.

Security Services Dissolved

NC1701145794 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1106 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Yerevan, 17 Jan (ARMENPRES)—By a decree of the Republic's president, the operative services of the State Directorate for the National Security of the Republic of Armenia have been dissolved and the activities of their employees have been suspended, with the exception of the Main Directorate for the Defense of the State Border and administrative services.

The objective is to restructure the inner parts of the State Directorate for National Security in light of problems facing the State Directorate for National Security under conditions of independent statehood.

With the same decree, Davit Shahnazaryan—the Armenian president's ambassador on special missions—has been appointed acting head of the State Directorate for National Security. Within three months he must conduct an inspection of the quality of the services of the Directorate and draw up and submit for the government's approval the bylaws, structure, and list of permanent staff.

Spokesman on Karabakh, Security Changes

NC1701184094 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1400 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Report by Gevorg Nazaryan from the news conference held by presidential press secretary Aram Abrahamyan in Yerevan on 17 January—recorded]

[Text] In opening the news conference, presidential press secretary Aram Abrahamyan said: Azerbaijan has been pressing ahead with military operations against Nagorno-Karabakh and the Armenian Republic. Its air attack was not directed against military objects but peaceful settlements. This clearly reveals Azerbaijan's real intentions in its war against Nagorno-Karabakh.

Despite that, Armenia is not deviating from its policy to strive for the peaceful settlement of the problem.

In recent days the press reported on a high-level quadripartite meeting between Azerbaijan, Karabakh, Armenia, and Russia. At present, there is no clear agreement on holding such a meeting, although, in principle Armenia favors the idea. This is the context in which the meeting was held between the Armenian and Azerbaijani defense ministers in Tbilisi on Saturday when they examined the military-technical aspects of a cease-fire. The press secretary noted that no concrete agreement was reached.

As already reported, the Armenian president issued a decree on 15 January on the restructuring of the State Directorate for National Security. In referring to that matter, Mr. Abrahamyan said: It is a requirement to revamp our structures to place them at the service of national statehood. One of such state structures is this directorate, whose specific purpose should be exclusively intelligence and counterintelligence work. To successfully fulfill these important functions, the directorate should undergo structural changes. The former structure was set up during the Soviet Union and was serving other purposes, primarily surveillance of dissidents. Naturally, such problems no longer exist in a democratic country. The Armenian citizens can worship and express any opinion freely and without restraint, and join any legal political organization.

The press secretary added: I consider it important to note that the president highly appreciates Eduard Simonyants [the former head of the State Directorate for National Security], and the planned restructuring has nothing to do with him. No matter who headed that directorate, its existing structure was beyond reform

without any serious structural changes. I can assure that Mr. Simonyants' abilities will be properly used in another state job.

The adoption of the privatization bill by the parliament is one of last week's important developments. Mr. Abrahamyan also touched on this matter. The implementation of the plan requires hard work from the government, and he thinks that the government will place that process under its strict control. He said: The state's aim is to harmonize and bring in tandem the privatization process with two other processes: The first is the creation of a system for social protection so that the socially unprotected strata can obtain financial assistance and goods from various sources, and therefore be able to meet their minimum requirements. The second is the creation of the market substructures serving the economy. In this, the banking system plays the leading role. The Armenian Central Bank should act like an orchestra conductor in the system, and here the need was also felt to introduce changes. These changes were made last week with the efforts of the president and the parliament.

He drew the reporters' attention to the president's decree on 15 December and on the course of its implementation. As you remember, that decree was designed to create favorable conditions for the import and sale of foodstuff. This decree gave concrete instructions to the Central Bank and government, and some of these instructions have already been implemented. The issue here involved introducing changes in the decision-making process inside the government aimed at eliminating bureaucratic infighting and the possibility of corruption. An operational staff has been set up under Shahen Petrosyan to establish law and order at the airports. The president's supervisory service has accomplished enormous work. This service set up an operative alarm team and established round-the-clock posts in Zvartnots, Yerepuni, and Shirak Airports. Despite all these measures, Mr. Abrahamyan said that the president's supervisory service and law enforcement organs revealed a number of cases of pilferage of money and goods and the misuse of official positions. A criminal investigation has been opened. The operative alarm teams of the supervisory service have resumed their work as of 14 January, not only in the airports but also along the highways north and south of Armenia. In case of any violation of the law, our businessmen could immediately inform the employees at the posts set up by the service.

Mr. Abrahamyan also replied to reporters' questions.

Azerbaijan Offensive Said Repulsed

NC1701191794 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1800 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] The situation remains tense all along the Karabakh battle front. The Nagorno-Karabakh Republic [NKR] Army units are waging heavy defensive battles. The NKR Defense Army press service has reported that yesterday the Azerbaijani troops continued their incessant attacks against the Karabakh positions. The fiercest battles took place in the direction of Askeran-Agdam. The enemy used scores of armored cars.

After destroying one tank, one armored car, and more than 60 soldiers, the Karabakh fighters forced the Azerbaijanis to retreat to their initial positions. Two were killed and seven injured on the Armenian side.

No substantial changes took place in the other sectors of the confrontation line.

The Karabakh positions at the eastern and southeastern sectors of the front have been coming under intensive artillery and rocket shelling since this morning.

Also, the Azerbaijani Air Force has again become active. A number of Azerbaijani warplanes tried to attack Stepanakert, the capital of the NKR, between 1000-1200 today. Details are still being verified.

The Armenian Defense Ministry Press Service has reported that it has been relatively calm on the Republic's border since yesterday night. No serious incidents have been reported.

Iranian Official on Joint Initiative on Karabakh

NC1701194694 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2000 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Text] Morteza Bank, head of the Eastern Europe and CIS Department at the Iranian Foreign Ministry, said in a news conference at the Iranian Embassy on 13 January that the developments taking place in the region naturally have a serious affect on the relations between our two countries. The search for ways to settle the Karabakh problem, which is one of the important regional problems, is the reason for my visit to Armenia, Bank said.

Asked by an ARMENPRES correspondent if a new Iranian-Russian mediation initiative could be expected following his visit that came in the aftermath of the recent visit to Iran and Azerbaijan by Russian Special Ambassador Kazimirov, Morteza Bank said: Naturally, the countries in the region could play a big part in the solution of that problem. Iran and Russia, which are the largest countries in the region, could engage in effective activity both with a separate and a joint initiative. Mr. Kazimirov's visit pursued such an aim. We have agreed to cooperate and positive developments have already taken place. Of course, this does not mean that our activity would not be coordinated with the efforts of the CSCE. I think that there are reasons for optimism that the will to attain peace is gaining ground.

In touching upon Armenian-Iranian economic and cultural relations, Bank noted that they are underlined by the principles and traditions of mutual interest, good-neigborliness, and centuries old friendship between the two countries, and these ties should develop normally.

Iran's Director for CIS Affairs Arrives for Visit

President Favors Expansion of Ties

LD1401192394 Tehran IRNA in English 1618 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Moscow Jan. 14, IRNA—The Armenian President, Levon Ter-Petrosyan in Yerevan Thursday [13 January] underlined the significance of Iran-Armenian ties in the region and stressed the necessity to boost bilateral cooperation.

He made the remark in a meeting with the Iranian Foreign Ministry's director general for CIS affairs, Morteza Bank, who is in Armenia to discuss Iran's stands on regional issues.

Bank conveyed the message of President Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani to Ter-Petrosyan in response to the Armenian president's written message. Bank also discussed regional developments as well as Iran's efforts to establish peace in the region with Ter-Petrosyan.

Ter-Petrosyan further underscored the need to settle the Karabakh crisis peacefully.

The Iranian official also met with the Armenian Vice-President, Gagik Arutyunyan, and reviewed issues of mutual interest especially economic cooperation between the two countries.

Meanwhile, in a seperate meeting with the Armenian Foreign Minister, Vagan Papazyan Thursday, Bank submitted the written message of Iran's Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati to Papazyan.

Bank noted that efforts should be made to prevent the Karabakh crisis from becoming an international problem and added that coordination among regional countries was necessary for putting an end to the dispute.

He also expressed Iran's willingness to cooperate with Russia to settle the crisis.

Papazyan stressed the need to contain the crisis, adding that Iran could play a significant role in settling the problem.

Foreign Minister Receives Official

NC1401153694 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1405 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Yerevan, 14 Jan (ARMENPRES)—The Armenian Foreign Minister Vahan Papazyan yesterday received Morteza Bank, head of the Eastern Europe and CIS Department at the Iranian Foreign Ministry, who is on a visit to Yerevan.

They discussed matters pertaining to the development of political, economic, and cultural cooperation between Armenia and Iran. Mr. Bank presented a message from the Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati in which Armenia's efforts for the establishment of peace in the Karabakh conflict zone was particularly highly assessed.

The Iranian diplomat also conveyed a verbal message from Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani to Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, who joined the meeting later on.

Premier Receives Iranian Charge d'Affaires

NC1401214894 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 2050 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] The Armenian Prime Minister Grant Bagratyan today received Iranian Charge d'Affaires in Armenia Ahmad Sobhani. They discussed matters pertaining to trade and economic cooperation between the two countries, in particular the Iran-Armenia gas pipeline, construction of the Megri bridge, organization of border trade, road and air transportation, coordination of customs activities, and investments.

The sides expressed satisfaction at the constructive measures taken by the governments of the two countries in these fields, and noted that there are real opportunities to substantially expand the economic ties between Armenia and Iran in 1994.

Mutual understanding was displayed on the Karabakh problem. They considered unacceptable the use of force which, by further deepening the conflict, is preventing the establishment of peace in the region.

The prime minister highly assessed Iran's efforts for the peaceful solution of the problem.

Armen Khachaturyan, coordinator of Armenian Government affairs, and other officials were present at the meeting.

Spokesman Positive Over Russia's Karabakh Role

LD1701161794 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1542 GMT 17 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 17 Jan—Russia is adhering to an impartial stance on the Karabakh settlement and is sincerely committed to stopping the bloodshed in the conflict zone, the Armenian president's press secretary said here today. Speaking at a briefing, Aram Abramyan gave a positive assessment of the recent statement by a Russian Foreign Ministry representative on Moscow continuing its mission of mediation in the region.

The representative of the Armenian leadership reported on the continuation of diplomatic efforts to overcome the crisis in the region, in particular, the continuing visit to the region by Vladimir Kazimirov, the Russian president's special envoy. The press secretary reiterated the known fact that Yerevan and Stepanakert have responded positively to the new peace-making initiative

by Russia and the CSCE. Now it is up to Azerbaijan, noted the Armenian representative.

Comments on Political Settlement

LD1401231194 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1740 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Report by Diplomatic Correspondents Dmitry Voskoboinikov, Igor Porshnev, Vitaly Trubetskoi and others; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature]

[Text] President Levon Ter-Petrosyan hopes that in January it will be possible to organize working meetings between the representatives of the Armenian and Azeri presidents concerning a political settlement of the Karabakh conflict, INTERFAX was told by Presidential Spokesman Aram Abramyan.

He said that at present Armenia was continuing consultations with the Russian leadership on the issue. Such consultations, said Abramyan, seem to be held between the Azeri leadership and the leaders of the self-proclaimed Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Abramyan said that to achieve a political settlement meetings at the level of foreign ministers, then at the level of the presidents who are to sign an agreement had been planned. So far, said the spokesman, it was a matter for the future.

Abramyan reaffirmed Armenia's preparedness to continue backing Russia's peace-making initiatives.

The chairman of the parliamentary commission on Nagorno-Karabakh, Seyran Bagdasaryan, said that not a single politician, not a single international organization had the right to determine the future of Nagorno-Karabakh. It was up to the people of Nagorno-Karabakh to decide their future status.

He believes, though, that some provisions of the program on the settlement of the Karabakh conflict, initiated by the Russian president's aide, the well-known political scientist Andranik Migranyan, are interesting and deserve to be considered.

IF Note: To settle the Karabakh and Abkhazian conflicts, Migranyan proposes to grant to Nagorno-Karabakh and Abkhazia broad self-rule within Azerbaijan and Georgia. It is also necessary to create demilitarized zones around Karabakh

'Split' Over Karabakh Recognition Noted

PM1701141594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 94 First Edition p 4

[Report by Sergey Babulumyan: "Split in Yerevan Over Whether Or Not To Recognize Nagorno-Karabakh Republic"]

[Text] Yerevan—People in Armenia want peace for the people of Karabakh and for themselves, a peace worthy of the losses sustained and the suffering endured. Translated into the language of specific action, this means an immediate cease-fire without prior conditions, guaranteeing the safety of the civilian population of Nagorno-Karabakh, and deciding at the negotiating table who is to repay debts, to whom, how much, and how.

President Levon Ter-Petrosyan is right to believe that he has the support of all Armenia on this issue. The republic, cut off from the outside world by a long-standing blockade, is barely able to keep its economy afloat. The war in Karabakh has in one way or another affected the well-being of every Armenian family, and people realize that it cannot go on endlessly.

"We have managed to strike off the agenda the status of Nagorno-Karabakh and focus entirely on the main problem: How can peace be achieved?", Aram Abramyan, the Armenian president's press secretary, told IZVESTIYA. "The two ways proposed by the CSCE and Russia are equally acceptable to us. The advantage of the Russian scenario is that it contains a specific mechanism to prevent the resumption of hostilities—to whit, the introduction of internationally-mandated peacekeeping forces into the conflict zone. Both plans of action proposed to the warring parties have won the approval of Stepanakert and Yerevan, but they were rejected by Azerbaijan. The conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh has today reached the stage where its peaceful resolution depends not only on the will of the warring parties, but also on that of the world community."

Armenia's political parties are unhappy that Yerevan has not made up its mind to recognize the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic [NKR]. Armenia's influential "Ramkavar-Azatakan" Liberal-Democratic Party is in favor of recognizing the NKR as an independent sovereign state. In the opinion of party leader Ruben Mirzakhanyan, this step would make it possible to unravel one of the tightest knots of the conflict. It is a question of the decision of the then Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of 1 December 1989 declaring Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] an inalienable part of Armenia.

It was clear at the time that this decision was as futile as the Azerbaijani authorities' ensuing decision to dissolve the NKAO. However, having effectively changed nothing, both documents are still formally in force to this day. Yerevan's official recognition of the NKR would, in Ruben Mirzkhanyan's opinion, remove the problem.

"We do not believe that the process of settling the conflict is becoming more productive as the group of international mediators expands," he said. In his opinion, this group should be confined to the warring parties' immediate neighbors—Turkey, Iran, and, undoubtedly, Russia.

"We have very serious disagreements with the authorities in our approach to the Nagorno-Karabakh problem," Vagan Oganesyan, one of the leaders of the "Dashnaktsutyun" opposition party, told IZVESTIYA. "We

cannot in particular see whether we are complying with the Supreme Soviet decision for Nagorno-Karabakh to accede to Armenia or whether we agree with its proclaiming itself the NKR? If Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh are in actual fact a single state, Azerbaijan is in effect at war with Armenia, whereas the latter does not acknowledge itself to be a state at war. "If we consider the NKR a separate state formation, why do we not recognize the republic de jure?" [quotation marks as published] Vagan Oganesyan wonders.

Vagan Oganesyan believes that Russia will play a crucial role in resolving the conflict and its participation in these affairs is therefore far more preferable to mediation by any other country or international organization.

Intellectuals Invite Zhirinovskiy for Jan Visit

MK1401141094 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 3

[Report by Konstantin Petrosov: "Will Zhirinovskiy Visit Armenia?"]

[Text] Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia, will visit the republic in mid-January at the invitation of Armenia's Council of Intellectuals, according to local mass media reports.

It is hard to say whether the fact is trustworthy and whether Vladimir Volfovich is coming to Armenia in the near future is possible at all especially in the wake of his promise to turn independent Armenia into a Yerevan gubernia as part of a Russian empire.

Armenian social scientists, however, think Armenia does have a social base for forces like Zhirinovskiy's, because populism and socialist ideas take a far from back seat in semi-starving countries.

Georgia

Shevardnadze on Summit, Geneva Abkhazia Talks

LD1601004094 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 2233 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By GIA-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tbilisi, 16 Jan—Speaking to foreign journalists, Georgian head of state Eduard Shevardnadze called the Russian-U.S. talks in Moscow a significant stage in relations between the East and West in the post-Communist period. In his opinion, the visit by the U.S. President is an important event both for the United States and Russia, and for Europe and all the republics of the former Soviet Union. "I an grateful to Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton and also to NATO for the attention paid to Georgia," he stressed.

Touching upon the results of the second round of the Geneva talks on settling the conflict in Abkhazia, the head of state noted that a feasible minimum was achieved in Geneva. "A great deal will depend on the resolution of the UN Security Council that, in our opinion, should envisage guarantees for implementing the commitments," Shevardnadze said. What is meant, in particular, is the participation of the peacekeeping forces under the aegis of the United States, of observers, and of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

The Georgian leader thinks that the consistent continuation of the UN policy in resolving the conflict will speed up the process of establishing peace in Abkhazia, taking into account the positive role of Russia and the interests of the United States, France, Britain, and other countries.

Wants UN Peacekeepers Sent Soon

LD1601165394 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1503 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Text] Georgian leader Eduard Shevardnadze says the process of resolving the conflict in Abkhazia can be fastened if the United Nations succeeds in implementing its policy at regional peace in full. He was commenting on the outcome of last week's talks in Geneva between Georgia and Abkhazia.

He spoke of negotiations being at a stage leading to peace calling for firm guarantees that what had been achieved was not wasted. Shevardnadze also called to speed up the sending of U.N. peacekeepers and observers to the region to become guarantors of security for tens of thousands of Georgian refugees returning to their homes in Abkhazia.

Shevardnadze pointed to the positive role that Russia had played in resolving the conflict.

Shevardnadze Satisfied With Visit to Turkey

LD1401190294 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1740 GMT 14 Jan 94

[From the "Presidential Bulletin" No. 9 feature]

[Text] Turkey will grant Georgia additional credit worth $50 Mn. The understanding was reached Thursday during the visit to Turkey by Georgian leader Eduard Shevardnadze, Interfax was told by the spokesman for the Georgian leader, Zaza Kandelaki.

The visit has shown, he said, that Georgia and Turkey have common interests. At the joint news conference in Ankara, Shevardnadze, according to the spokesman, said that Turkey is taking a real part in stabilizing the Georgian economy.

In an interview with reporters at the Tbilisi airport, Shevardnadze said that his visit to Turkey following Georgia's entry into the Commonwealth of Independent States was very important. He emphasized the package of economic problems discussed at the talks. The Georgian leader said that there are good prospects for the

Georgian economy. "If the process of stabilization continues in Georgia, we shall receive more essential aid from Turkey," he said.

The speaker of the parliament of the Ajarian Autonomous Republic, Aslan Abashidze, told Interfax that during the visit the two sides reached understanding with the Turkish government on Turkish energy supplies to Ajaria beginning January 25. Also signed were other agreements on cooperation.

Shevardnadze Grants 'Weekly' Interview 17 Jan

LD1701113094 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0648 GMT 17 Jan 94

["Regular weekly" studio interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, Georgia's head of state and chairman of the republic's parliament, by program presenter Oniani—live]

[Text] [Oniani] Good morning, friends, we present you a radio interview. Greetings Eduard; a Georgian official state delegation last week visited Turkey. What do you think are the most important results of this visit? And another question; Turkey was brought out of the political and economic crisis by the so-called Turkish wonder, as well as the will of the whole nation. To what extent is Georgia ready to share this experience? Because the instability in Georgia today was earlier no less alien for Turkey.

[Shevardnadze] Good morning. I spoke widely about the results at the meeting of the Tbilisi branch of the Citizens' Union of Georgia, and therefore, I will not dwell on them. The results, both political and economic, are quite impressive. Many contracts and agreements are to be signed. We have signed many agreements. Batoni Chikvaidze, who stayed on in Turkey and phoned me yesterday, told me that the issue of credits is being resolved positively. Other prospects have been mapped out, among them being cooperation in the field of science and culture, and many others.

One important result is our mutual understanding, good mutual understanding, of the processes which are under way in the Caucasus, and, in particular, in Georgia, and on a wider scale, in Europe and the world. From this standpoint, the visit was undoubtedly a success.

The second question, which is of no less interest for us all, our citizens—how did Turkey achieve success with its economy and in developing democracy and political life? Your question in effect implied the answer. I may reiterate it, but I will be brief. It achieved it by being patient; by declaring and setting genuinely national and state interests as the highest goal; by integrating into the European and world economy. It did not refuse it. [as heard] From the very beginning it refused the policy of being shut out and living in isolation, which brought Georgia to this dead-end. Unlike Georgia, Turkey followed a completely different course, which has brought it tremendous success; it could be called a wonder. At the meeting with business circles, where unique dialogues and conversations were held with about 200 businessmen and bank representatives of Turkey, and where you [Oniani] were not allowed, we saw a 20-minute movie about Turkey's wonder—if we call it this. Having seen this movie I have drawn a conclusion for myself as to how Turkey managed to achieve such success in a comparatively short span of history. Turks have tried may forms of rule over the last 20 years. You know there has been a coup d'etat and military dictatorship. The ruling democracy, as I would call it, proved to be the best. There is quite a strong opposition, there is political pluralism, but there is the most important thing, which you can feel everywhere—the people's wish, their disposition. Common state interests and party interests do not damage state interests. I think that if we are to learn anything—and there is much that we must learn—it is establishing this kind of attitude in Georgia.

[Oniani] Mr. Shevardnadze, Suleyman Demirel, in an interview with us, said that Georgia and Turkey have a lot in common and that a lot of Georgians live in Turkey and are very good citizens. You met some of them; among them the minister of agriculture, Refaettin Sahin, was always with our delegation. There were others as well. You were given Georgian magazines which are published in Turkey, including CHVENEBURI magazine. There were warm contacts there. What can you say about them? How important was it to you as the head of state to meet these Georgians?

[Shevardnadze] To say that I was indifferent to them and looking at them casually would not be true. I have always met these people this way. [as heard] In this respect—about the Georgians there—I would like to say, and we in Georgia must comprehend it well, that first they are honorable citizens of their own country, as Demirel said and you just repeated. They are honorable citizens of their country, Turkey. Therefore, for honesty and faithfulness to the state, the Turkish Government values them greatly, and trusts and respects them. By playing such a role they will also play the role of a bridge of friendship between Georgia and Turkey. They will do a very good service also to Georgia by being faithful to their adopted country, being devoted, honest and being good citizens and, as I said, they can also play a role as a bridge of friendship.

[Oniani] In Turkey you put forward the idea of the commonwealth of commonwealths, that is the CIS plus the alliance of the Black Sea basin countries plus the CSCE. What is it? Is it a continuation of the process of integration or one more mechanism of self-defense for Georgia, and not only Georgia?

[Shevardnadze] This is what I would call objective processes, which are under way in today's world. Countries on their own, even gigantic countries will not be able to resolve the issues they are facing, and integration is one of the most important characteristic events of this epoch. Such form of integration as the CIS must be reckoned with within the limits of the vast general

process of integration. But the processes in the south, that is, in the Black Sea basin countries, the economic alliance of the Black Sea countries, which is making its first steps and which is just starting to function realistically, must also be taken into consideration. Whatever has already happened in Europe must all the more be reckoned with—the European Community has taken 30 years to form, and it has reached definite standards and a high level. Generally speaking, when I was talking about the commonwealth of commonwealths, what I mean by the commonwealth of commonwealths is that this commonwealth is not directed against anyone, and must be viewed as a constituent part of the general process of integration. The commonwealth of commonwealths, as you have just said, is the road leading to a space of a single economic or military security which can assume either European, Euro-Asian or finally, a world scale. The commonwealth of commonwealths is the road leading to a space of a single security.

[Oniani] Turkey, which has not yet managed to join the European Community, must have been interested in this idea.

[Shevardnadze] Many ideas voiced by us or the Turkish authorities have a lot in common. And one more thing, the commonwealth of commonwealths responds to NATO's latest initiatives and Clinton's address—Partnership for Peace. I view it as a single complex leading to a vast single space.

[Oniani] Mr. Shevardnadze, at the meeting with President Demirel and Husamettin Cindoruk, chairman of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, your suggestion that the meeting of the presidents of the countries of the alliance [Black Sea basin countries] be held in Tbilisi, was approved. You said that judging from this, you believed that order would be established in Tbilisi and Georgia. Establishing order on the highways was discussed at the meeting with businessmen. Enforcement of order was the main theme at the conference of the Tbilisi branch of the Citizens' Union of Georgia, yet rumors circulate that there is a pressure from the high echelons of either authorities or the government, and that these measures will stop halfway and will never be continued.

[Shevardnadze] I announced at the meeting the day before yesterday that those who oppose the will of the people, irrespective of what post they may occupy, will not remain in their posts. Order will be established by all means. We cannot stop halfway and we will not stop; this movement making the the country healthier and clearing the atmosphere will not be stopped. If it is stopped, then people will sweep away everybody and everything that prevents them from achieving the set goal.

[Oniani] At the Citizens' Union of Georgia conference it was noted that the union's youth organization had been formed. This was announced by Giorgi Maisuradze and Giorgi Baramidze. What is your attitude toward this fact and how do you assess it?

[Shevardnadze] I am proud of the youths who are joining the Citizens' Union and those who decided to set up a youth satellite organization having the orientation of the Citizens' Union. They are wonderful youths. I would say one more thing: That the Citizens' Union is an organization for young people—not only of young people, but for them, as well. This initiative was raised at one of the sessions of the board of the Union, and we all supported it actively. It is a brilliant generation, and they will undoubtedly make our union and the country too, more beautiful, richer, and they will mature, grow up and take over tommorow's Georgia.

[Oniani] You said at the conference that the process of Russia's change has begun; and later you said that we would resolve the issue of returning to Abkhazia. We already know about the activities of our delegation in Geneva; a paragraph on the inviolability of the Caucasian borders was contained in a Brussels declaration at a NATO meeting, where Americans raised a peace initiative. In the immediate future, President Yeltsin is to visit Georgia. Judging from all these events, how advantageous are the circumsatnces for resolving the Abkhaz issue and how will Russia participate in this pocess?

[Shevardnadze] Resolving the Abkhaz issue without Russia's active participation is impossible. However, anegative role by Russia at different stages may have been, still, today it is such a palpable reality that one should be blind not to be able to see it. [sentence as heard] Therefore, I would say that Russia's participation in peace-keeping initiatives and in resolving the Abkhaz issue in a peaceful manner is a decisive role—of course, together with and under the auspices of, and not contradictory to the United Nations. Some people are trying to juxtapose them and find a definite contradiction between them. There are no contradictins here. We must also consider Russia's realistic interests when we are talking about securing Georgia's interests in Abkhazia, and not only in Abkhazia. If we understand each other so well—and I think we should understand each other well and that we will take into consideration each other's interests—then I believe that the Abkhaz issue will soon be resolved and the refugees will soon return to their homes. Therefore, I repeat, if we want Russia to understand us, then we must understand Russia, the aches, difficulties and contradictions which the Russian state is faced with now. I think that this process of mutual understanding and of building good-neighborly and friendly relations is going well.

Now, as for a very important stage in the life of our two countries, President Yeltsin's forthcoming visit—it is still early days to talk about dates—will be a great event. I am sure that our citizens welcome his visit. The Tbilisi branch of the Citizens' Union, when I asked them how our capital would receive him, everyone unanimously expressed their feelings and attitude by saying that we must receive him as an honored guest, a representative of a great country, our great neighbor, the president of a great country.

At the same time, I would like to remind you of several things that have to be mentioned before his visit. President Yeltsin will be a desired guest for Georgia, among other reasons because—Georgians know it well, and those who do not, must know—it is necessary to take into consideration his role in dismantling the empire. Yeltsin is one of the most impressive and distinguished figures, who has taken decisive steps, especially after the August putsch, when he took a course of dismantling the empire, and on the ruins of the empire is building a new form of relations and cooperation which we today call the CIS. It would be a little difficult to talk about Yeltsin without this role; his role was undoubtedly an historical one.

Many citizens of Tbilisi remember that after 9 April [massacre of demonstrators in Tbilisi by Soviet Army troops], Yeltsin, who was in the opposition, was one of the first people to visit Tbilisi to express his condolences. I think this must not be forgotten. There is one more thing I wish to recall for the population in Tbilisi and throughout Georgia: When, at a union congress of deputies, Army prosecutor Katushev accused and started to press charges against Georgia, Yeltsin was the first man to leave the hall as a sign of protest. He was then followed by several hundreds of deputies who also left as a sign of protest. Thus, I have always considered him to be Georgia's friend and I would like that the Georgian people receive him as our friend, a great neighbor and friend.

[Oniani] The document signed during the meeting between Clinton and Yeltsin, when Clinton arrived in the post-Soviet territory, was viewed as one of the full stops at the end of the Cold War. What can be done about real wars, either in Georgia, the Balkans, or Nagorno-Karabakh, which assumed a horrendous scale?

[Shevardnadze] I think that the Clinton-Yeltsin meeting is an important stage, the most important stage for creating a new world strategy since the end of the Cold War, in the same way as the NATO meeting. These are not contradictory events as some people claim by explaining that if NATO becomes stronger and its influence widens, then Russia will die. On the contrary, work will be directed toward creating and forming the single strategic space, to be more accurate, the single security space. I think that we must go even more assiduously toward creating a new world strategy, a new space for security in the world—of course, including its guarantees, security guarantees for the world.

Clinton's visit was one of these steps. If we continue more assiduously, I am sure that every conflict will be resolved. I think that the experience accumulated in the United Nations about the Abkhaz and Samachablo issues...[pauses] if we end the work which we started it will be a good precedent of how the United Nations, the CSCE and great individual countries like the United States of America, Russia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, England can combine their efforts in order to resolve these local conflicts so that they do not spread. Thus, these conflicts will be resolved and settled in the process of creating this common space.

[Oniani] You mentioned at the news conference held before you left Turkey that Abkhazia will be a test case for the United Nations and Russia.

[Shevardnadze] When I said that I meant that the conflict in Abkhazia is not of such a vast scale that large states and the United Nations could not resolve it, it is at the same time a potentially very dangerous conflict and resolving it will be a classical example of how a conflict could be settled by means of joint efforts by many states and such a great international organization.

[Oniani] Thank you. It was announced on Georgian television yesterday that some persons guilty of finance and credit breaches had been exposed. Then it was announced that the Caucasus Concern, the Caucasus Exchange was a founder of noncommodity operations in Georgia. It begs a natural question—the leader of this organization today is a vice premier of Georgia [Amiran Kadagishvili].

[Shevardnadze] In principle, I do not wish to jump to conclusions before the investigation is over. I knew that it would be mentioned yesterday—not this particular fact, but that 12 criminal cases had been instituted. As for drawing the conclusion that the Exchange is mainly to blame, and that it caused everything—I think it is a little hasty and a premature decision. I think that a wide-scale investigation must be carried out; 12 cases have been instituted, but there may be cases coming up. The fact is that cases have been instituted, and the beginning of an investigation does not define guilt as yet. It will be a complex case and will have to go through complex stages; the process of investigation, then everything must be examined in the prosecutor's office and the prosecutor's conclusion must be confirmed, then court of law follows, and nobody knows what the court will decide. Therefore, let us not jump the gun; let the investigation carry out the task delegated to it by the head of state. I think that everything will be clarified, among other things, the role of the previous government, which imposed the premature introduction of the coupon on parliament and the head of state. Instead of finding a common language with Russia, we made haste and introduced the so-called national currency, to be more accurate, a transitional form of the national currency. The coupon had to be devalued, however unpalatable it may be to say it, and so it did. I do not want to usurp the name of soothsayer, but right from the beginning of the parliamentary sessions I made no secret of it, and I said then that devaluation was imminent. Then I said that it was a forceful step, and not a natural one toward a national currency that is slightly different—like it was chosen by other countries, among them our neighbors—a parallel existence of two currencies which painlessly settled the transition to a new feature. [sentence as heard] Much has to be said about the coupon. The issue of whether we will be able to save it or not is problematic. We must try to save it. Once we have made

this step and parliament and the executive authorities have made this decision, we must do everything in order to save it, but not in the way they suggest.

I watch television and often we are told to forbid selling everything in rubles or dollars and so on. Any kind of ban will result in repercussions and will lead us to the condition whereby products will not be imported; there will be nothing. Therefore, the way of introducing a ban is not the way to strengthen the coupon and we made a mistake when we stated in parliament that it was the sole means of payment. The coupon cannot be strengthened by force; therefore, we must seek other ways, and the authorities are assessing this today.

[Oniani] And yet, our entry into the ruble zone is much talked about. How important and useful is it for Georgia if the entry means handing gold mines over to Russia, refusing independent finance and credit emission, annulling economic laws on the Georgian territory for the benefit of Russia, Russia's appointing one of the vice presidents of the National Bank, and so on? There are many demands from the Russian side.

[Shevardnadze] Regarding talks and, moreover, a decision about joining the ruble zone—this issue is unripe. It was probably right that talks and discussions have been started, and Vakhtang Goguadze was right to have raised this issue that has become a topic for discussion. But it does not mean at all that we are to make a decision in the immediate future on joining the ruble zone. It was hasty to have left the zone—it was still early in the game—unprepared and unripe in the same way as the issue of joining the zone is unripe today. This problem has not been studied deeply and substantively by scientists and specialists. Yesterday I noticed the opinion poll carried out in the street, and there were terrific responses. Ask specialists—I am a consumer, a common consumer—call specialists and let them tell us what the ruble zone is, what we shall gain, and what we shall lose. Once again, I repeat, we must study this issue as one of the solutions to the problem, not the only one. We must seek other ways also. I may say that I do not rule out that another more effective way may be found.

One more thing: Now that people are insulting Goguadze, practically calling him the anti-Christ, and wondering how he could have said such a thing, nobody is asking if Russia will accept us in the ruble zone. I think it is a problematic issue. In his statement yesterday, Gaydar spoke about his disagreement over Belarus joining the ruble zone. Russia knows very well that such a poor country as Georgia joining the ruble zone would mean more of a burden, expenses, additional expenses—she knows it very well. It is not right to kill each other over arguments on whether to join this zone not knowing Russia's stance.

I must say that our political culture is on such a level that we must beat each other up for having a different view. It has become a custom unfortunately.

A lot is being said about gold deposits. I do not want to say how many kilos we are talking about. The Russians have a saying that translated in Georgian sounds approximately like: Weight of a cat's tear. This is what our gold deposits equal to compared with our rights. It is not significant, it may last us 10-15 days, giving us a temporary respite. We have no more gold deposits. If we had had a lot of gold then we would have been a different country and state, and the coupon would have had a different value. Now, this is how I see it. When am I going to express my view on whether it is going to be the ruble zone, lari [name of the planned Georgian currency], or the coupon, or anything else? I shall probably express my views after my visits in Paris.

[Oniani] It will probably be held this week, will it not?

[Shevardnadze] Hopefully. What does the status of a developed country, which we have just attained, have in store for us? It means a lot. I shall have contacts with those heads and directors-general who know this business very well and what it would mean for us economically, financially, and so on.

I can answer this question more definitely after I meet the World Bank and its management, the management of the International Monetary Fund, and the U.S. Administration—especially the international organizations like the IMF and the World Bank. I must carry out a special investigation and account for those $200 million that Sigua says Shevardnadze has hidden away. I do not know where it has been hidden, and if Christopher Columbus was trying to discover America, I, too, shall set off looking for the $200 million and maybe I shall discover it. [laughs] God help me, I may find it. After I have done all this, I shall be able to say what might happen with the coupon and what are the ways out from this state.

[Oniani] Your visit to France begins later this week. What do you expect from this visit?

[Shevardnadze] I am going to France with great hopes. Not because I am going to bring back suitcases of dollars and francs and so on...

[Oniani, interrupting] I hope you will not bring coupons with you.

[Shevardnadze, continuing] ...not only for this. Although there may be something interesting in this regard as well.

France has traditionally been Georgia's friend. It has always been so and that is still the case today. It is especially tangible now that the Abkhaz issue is so acute. France is one of the initiators of a group called the Group of Georgia's Friends, which together with the United Nations is aspiring to establish peace in Abkhazia and peacefully resolve the conflict there. This envisages the return of refugees, restoring the economy of Abkhazia, and so on.

It would not be right for a young democratic and independent country not to have a legal basis with such a great country as France—a country that has a great reputation and weight.

A wonderful treaty on cooperation, friendship, and understanding between the two countries has been prepared, and President Mitterrand and I will sign it. After that, intensive relations between our two countries will start.

We are to join the Paris Charter in France. Since the end of the Cold War this charter has been regulating relations in Europe and not only in Europe. The United States and Canada have joined it. This is a charter recognized all over the world.

Of course, I am looking forward to a meeting with President Mitterrand, who is one the most remarkable politicians of our times. Many other interesting and useful meetings are awaiting us in Paris, including meetings with UNESCO and other international organizations, various parties, government leaders, and so on.

I think that close ties with Paris and a process of establishing closer ties, which is now starting and which lays the foundation of our new relations, will undoubtedly help us emerge from the crisis as soon as possible. I am leaving for Paris with these hopes.

[Oniani] Thank you very much. You have been listening to the head of state and Supreme Council chairman, Eduard Shevardnadze.

Comments on Social Situation

LD1601224194 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1900 GMT 16 Jan 94

[Address by State Council Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze at inaugural conference of Tbilisi branch of Citizen's Union of Georgia held at the Philharmonic Society concert hall in Tbilisi on 15 January—recorded]

[Text] The Citizens' Union, as a political organism, as an organization which, if not today, then in the future, must become a pillar of the state and our top-level politics, has not emerged on the wave of destruction. We did not [words indistinct] down with this government and we do not believe that a new government will work miracles. We came with the belief that destruction must stop in Georgia. Anarchy must stop in Georgia. This terrible process must be stopped and let us all together start construction. If this happens and if these are not our union's empty words, then we will gain a civil [Georgian: mokalakeobrivi] right to be a leading and fundamental force in a democratic Georgian state, in the state of Georgia.

I can draw a more dramatic picture [of the situation in Georgia] than the orator who spoke before me. I profoundly respect Batoni Chkheidze, who is one of the greatest patriots of the [Tbilisi] city and, also, an expert in his profession. I can draw an even more terrible picture. I can say how many people are perishing, including how many have starved to death, how many people are being killed, how much violence there is, how many houses are being destroyed, how many streets are full of [uncollected] refuse and so on and so forth.

You will then, naturally, ask me what we should do. There are two ways. One way is to lose heart and say that nothing will save this country. I am categorically against this. This is not true. The country can be saved. I have said it before and I am repeating this for a third time. Georgia will be saved. These are not empty words and phrases. The country will be saved, if we do something about it, if we start working, if everybody minds their own business, if professionals do their job, if the government does its job and if citizens and the government struggle together to save the country.

I spent a day and a half in Turkey. There was a television report about (?the visit). One cannot report everything. It is impossible to report everything. The television camera fails to catch everything. I decided to refrain from a television interview only to tell you first about my impression. We were received there as worthy representatives of a worthy country. And, not only there [in Turkey]. In every country I have visited—and there will probably be more visits in future because we have no other choice—we (?were received) as representatives of a democratic country which enjoys full rights and has a future. They are ready to have relations with us.

In Turkey, I remembered Ataturk's words. I think that the television carried this. This person who saved Turkey—and you can see his pictures anywhere you go in Turkey—said: we need a strong and good neighbor east of Turkey, and Georgia will be such a neighbor. They are saying this today as well. The current president and prime minister are saying this: we need Georgia as a good neighbor and friend. When I was talking about neighborhood and friendship, [Turkish President Suleyman] Demirel said: I do not agree with you, we are brothers, we want to build fraternal relations with you, with our strong and good neighbor Georgia. They believe in us more than we do in ourselves, more than we believe in our (?abilities).

I do not share the terrible pessimism which has hit our society. We are competing with each other in drawing the most terrible picture. This applies to any party. This applies to any parliamentarian. Of course, I do not mean our majority faction here. [Reference to majority faction in the Georgian parliament which supports Shevardnadze]. They all believe that the present government should resign and a new government should come. I assure you that—of course, this is not an ideal authority, nor is the head of state ideal, and (?he) can be blamed for many shortcomings and many disasters—a better government will come tomorrow.

Young people spoke who here today, Zurab [apparently, Zurab Zhvania, the secretary-general of the Citizens' Union and the leader of the Green Party] and others, will

come to the fore. However, we, representing an older generation, should show and prove that we are able to struggle together with them. We can teach them how to live and struggle. We will struggle until we are alive.

'Mkhedrioni' Paramilitary Group Disarms

LD1401175794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Most members of the Georgian paramilitary group, formerly known as "Mkhedrioni," have surrendered arms as of Friday, Interfax was told by the group's spokesman. Those who are against will be excluded from the group, he said.

The decision for disarmament of the group headed by the founder of "Mkhedrioni," Djaba Ioseliani, was made January 10 by the Georgian authorities to help restore order in the republic. The surrendered arms are stored in the group's warehouses.

Interior Ministry Sends APCs to Downtown Tbilisi

LD1501192794 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1704 GMT 15 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi January 15 TASS—The Georgian Interior Ministry introduced today APCs in key areas of downtown Tbilisi and concentrated there almost all personnel of the city police due to Zviadist attempts to hold mourning arrangements in connection with the supposed death of the ex-president.

Although the death has not been confirmed it is believed the body of Zviad Gamsakhurdia is buried in western Georgia. Zviadists demand a funeral ceremony: a minute of silence with the suspension of work of enterprises, organizations and traffic, as well as rallies that are banned by the state of emergency regime introduced in Georgia on September 20, 1993.

No excesses or clashes between the Tbilisi police and supporters of the ex-president were reported today.

Gamsakhurdia Widow Accuses Ministry of 'Misinformation'

LD1401181794 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Manana Gamsakhurdia, the widow of the former Georgian president, told INTERFAX that his family objected not only to making the dead body available for a post mortem, but to making it available to the Tbilisi regime as well.

"The reports of our consent are the Georgian Interior Ministry's exercise in misinformation. I have no intention to go to Georgia because I have nothing to do with terrorists and murderers. I demand that the body be moved to Chechnya for burial," Mrs. Gamsakhurdia said.

In her words, she was visited by Chechen President Dzhokhar Dudayev, who told her that as a mediator he would insist on doing as the deceased's family desired.

Appeals for Burial Help

LD1701171094 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1630 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Manana, Zviad Gamsakhurdia's widow, has sent a telegram to Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the Russian Federal Assembly asking for help in having her husband's body buried in Chechnya. She informed the Chechenpress agency about this today.

The widow of Georgia's former president, who committed suicide, said she was categorically against representatives of Tbilisi officialdom carrying out forensic tests on her husband's body. Her view is that they would be used for political purposes by Zviad Gamsakhurdia's enemies.

Issues Burial 'Conditions'

LD1801094094 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0500 GMT 18 Jan 94

[Text] A message from Manana Archvadze-Gamsakhurdia and Chechen Vice President Zelimkhan Yandarbiyev addressed to Eduard Shevardnadze arrived in Tbilisi from Groznyy yesterday, 17 January. Here is the text of the message.

To Mr Shevardnadze, the Government House, Tbilisi, Georgia.

In order to resolve issues relating to the reburial of Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia, we inform you of the Gamsakhurdia family conditions, upon which the decision to issue a written confirmation of compliance with the conditions below will depend [as heard].

1. Conditions must be created for an unhindered and immediate reburial of the body on the territory of the Chechen Republic, where the family is temporarily residing.

2. The family, death witnesses and other persons involved in procedures connected with the reburial of the body must be given guarantees of immunity and permission to leave Georgia immediately.

3. The family members and death witnesses categorically refuse to participate in any investigation or study in connection with the death of Gamsakhurdia.

4. The family of President Gamsakhurdia categorically refuses to allow a dissection or examination of the body of the deceased or any other action except on-the-spot identification.

5. The family of the deceased demands that an international group be set up to monitor the implementation of the above-mentioned conditions.

The family categorically demands that the above-mentioned conditions be implemented in the shortest period.

The message is signed by Manana Archvadze and the Vice President of the Chechen Republic Yandarbiyev.

[Word indistinct] categorical demands give rise to controversial questions, which were answered late yesterday, 17 January, at a press conference held by Georgian Security Minister Igor Giorgadze, and Acting Prosecutor-General Jamlet [name indistinct].

The Georgian side reaffirmed the guarantees issued earlier of an unhindered reburial and of security for the members of the team of experts and Zviad Gamsakhurdia's relatives and fellow fighters who arrive from Groznyy with the aim of reburying the deceased.

Under international legal norms, a forensic examination is necessary to establish the real circumstances of a death case. The Georgian side agrees to include in the international commission specialists proposed by Zviad Gamsakhurdia's family and the official authorities of Chechnya.

As reported, in connection with this incident, the government of the Republic of Georgia has invited a group of international experts to Georgia. The director of the German institute of forensic medicine, Professor Bonte, and Russian scientists, Professors (Igor Banov) and Aleksandr Isayev, arrived in Tbilisi on 17 January. In connection with the same incident, a forensic sciences doctor, philosophy doctor, member of the royal pathological research society, Professor Peter S.. S..—sorry, I cannot pronounce the surname—of Glasgow University arrives in Tbilisi today.

Estonia

Minister Luik on Clinton-Yeltsin Meeting

WS1801085894 Tallinn Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Release in English 17 Jan 94

["Comments by Estonian Foreign Minister Juri Luik on the Clinton-Yeltsin Meeting"; place and date not given—received via Internet]

[Text] We are very pleased that the two presidents [Clinton and Yeltsin] agreed on the need for Russia to respect the sovereignty and independence of its neighbours. We are especially pleased by President Clinton's strong support for the withdrawal of Russian troops in early 1994. Meeting its international commitment to do so is, in my opinion, the best way to demonstrate Russia's sincerity in respecting Estonia's sovereignty and independence. After all, what country can be called sovereign and independent if foreign troops continue to be based on the territory against its will. On the issue of human rights, another topic to come up in the meetings between the two Presidents, Estonia is pleased to agree with the findings of the United States Department of State in its report of January 1993 as well as of the CSCE Commission of the United States Congress in its exhaustive study of the issue published in September 1993. Those reports found, along with over a dozen other international organizations, that Estonia belongs to that group of free nations where human rights are not violated.

I quite agree with the comments by President Yeltsin that double standards should not be applied to the question of human rights. We of course know that Russia has used human rights as a political tool. President Yeltsin's comments are clearly an attempt to sway international public opinion against Estonia and, as such, have nothing to do with the actual situation of Russians living in Estonia.

Comments on New Appointments

WS1701152194 Tallinn ETA NEWS BULLETIN in English 0811 GMT 17 Jan 94

[From 17 January PAEVALEHT, p 3]

[Excerpt] Monday, January 17—New Foreign Minister Juri Luik said that he accepted the offer of the ministerial post since he already had some experience in foreign politics. He had also stressed the political aspect in his work as the defence minister, Luik added.

Luik commended the intellectual potential of the Foreign Ministry and hoped that he could exploit it efficiently. He also expressed his confidence that the new Defence Minister Indrek Kannik will manage well.

The main guarantee of Estonia's statehood is its impeccable reputation and other countries' awareness of Estonia, Luik went on. It is extremely difficult to interfere in the politics of a peaceful and stable country and there are few states ready for an outright aggression, he stressed. [passage omitted]

Leaders Request To Join 'Partnership for Peace'

WS1401202994 Tallinn BNS in English 1603 GMT 14 Jan 94

[Text] Tallinn, Jan 14, BNS—Estonian President Lennart Meri and Prime Minister Mart Laar today signed a letter to NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner informing him of Estonia's wish to join the Partnership for Peace program.

Meri said after the signing this is "a historic decision that will have a stabilizing effect not only on Estonia but on the entire northern Europe, and which concerns all Estonia's neighbors." In the president's view, neither a system of agreements nor a well-equipped army offer the most reliable guarantees of peace, but a democratic system of government. "Democratic states never pose a danger to each other," he said.

"Partnership for Peace was the best NATO could at present offer to East European states," Meri said. Commenting on Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas' bid for full NATO membership, Meri said Estonia and Lithuania face different problems, and that there are no foreign troops in Lithuania nor territorial issues that need solving.

Laar said Lithuania did not inform the Estonian Government of its request for NATO membership alluding to problems arising from the differences between the Estonian and the Lithuanian Constitutions. He affirmed, however, that the meetings of the three states' premiers have repeatedly touched on Baltic cooperation in the framework of the Partnership for Peace program. The Estonian premier cited the setting up of the Baltic peacekeeping battalion as a concrete step in this direction.

Asked whether the joint signing of the letter today signifies "domestic peace" between the president and the prime minister, Meri said, "The joint signing of this document should rule out such rhetorical questions being asked here today."

Negotiator to Talks With Russia Views Delay

WS1801092194 Tallinn BNS in English 1828 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Tallinn, Jan 17, BNS—Estonia agrees in principle to Russia's proposal to withdraw its troops from Estonia by Aug. 31, but expects Russia to present a detailed withdrawal timetable in the next round of talks, Vaino Reinart, Estonia's top negotiator at talks with Russia, told BNS.

"When we get the timetable, we can say whether we agree to it or not," he said. "But, it shouldn't affect the final deadline of troop pullout, which we are in principle prepared to accept."

The head of the Estonian delegation noted that Estonia's chief requirement is that Russian combat units should leave Tallinn.

The next round of Estonian-Russian negotiations was scheduled to begin tomorrow near Moscow, but it was postponed due to Russia's top negotiator Vasili Svirin's sickness. Reinart said the new date will be set within a week.

Reinart affirmed that his appointment as head of the Estonian delegation is not going to change the delegation's work.

"The general direction of the talks is anyway set by the foreign minister, and we work closely together with (Estonian Foreign Minister) Juri Luik," Reinart told BNS.

Reinart was appointed head of the Estonian delegation last week. He succeeded former Defense Minister Juri Luik, who was appointed Foreign Minister.

President, Premier Disagree on Russian Money

MK1401132094 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian 14 Jan 94 p 5

["ADC" report: "President and Premier Take Divergent Stands on Penetration of Russian Capital Into Republic's Economy"]

[Text] Estonia Prime Minister Mart Laar has termed as naive nationalism the statement of President Lennart Meri to the State Assembly in which the latter voiced the fear that the state had no sufficiently clear idea about the penetration into Estonia of Russian capital under the cover of dummy firms and dummy persons. Addressing a press conference after the government session on 11 January, the premier pleaded that the government was taking account of the danger of expansion of Russian capital, taking measures and keeping the situation under control. While keeping tabs on the activities of major monopolies of the neighbor country in the national economy, however, the government does not intend to interfere in specific deals. Answering a question about possible restrictions on Russian capital in Estonia, Mr. Laar said that there was no need for that. It would be a rash act for Estonia to bar the inflow of capital, investments, and the creation of joint firms with businessmen from any country in the East or in the West. "This would be disastrous for us," he underscored. In this connection the prime minister sharply criticized the president's call to support Estonian capital exclusively. "I am not idolizing Estonian capital," he stated quoting the Chinese aphorism about cats of different colors: white or black, it doesn't matter if they catch mice. "We are only against major monopolies" that would be able to gain inordinate influence here.

As for Russia, it is second to Finland today as Estonia's trading partner, as regards import and export, according to the Estonian Finance Ministry. Commodity circulation in the third quarter of 1993 amounted to nearly 1 million cronas. Russia's share in Estonian export reaches 20 percent and nearly 19 percent in import. Estonia boasts a small but positive balance in its trade with Russia. Cars are in first place in importance in the overall export structure of Estonia. In the first quarter this export item accounted for 185 million cronas; in the second, 230; and in the third, 320. Buying cars in the West, Estonian firms keep about a third of them, selling the greater part in the East at a profit. There is a small stream of cars flowing in from East to West (Zhiguli and Moskvich cars). This is, according to Sergey Trofimov, chief specialist of Estonia's Finance Ministry, quite normal business: buy low and sell high.

In fourth place is fuel: 174 million cronas in the third quarter of 1993. This business is also quite legitimate. Estonia buys fuel from Russia and resells it at a profit in the West. Notably, Russian firms often ask Estonian firms to act as brokers.

The fifth position is taken by nonferrous metals. Their export in the third quarter was worth 170 million cronas. The amount of these metals imported by Estonia, according to Mr. Trofimov, was worth several tens of million of cronas. Where does the metals for export come from? First, from pilfering inside the country. Second, it is being smuggled out of Russia. Notably, both countries make money in the process. True, in Russia it is private persons rather than the state. But this situation is likely to change after Russia takes full control on its side of the border.

And finally, on 11 January, the Estonian Government confirmed a treaty with Russia on cooperation in the area of standardization, certification, and metrology, which would also promote trade between the two countries.

Latvia

Troops To Fire To Protect 'Military Objects'

LD1401155094 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1529 GMT 14 Jan 94

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga January 14 TASS—The command of the Russian North-Western troops ordered Russian military in Latvia to open fire in case of new attacks on military objects, the north-western troops press-centre reported Friday.

Officers sent to settle conflict situation are to be accompanied by armed guards. Armed units on duty will

protect military objects which do not have permanent guards. In order to avoid misunderstanding commanders of military units are to notify local authorities and residents about these measures.

The order was issued in connection with the incident, which took place in Latvia Monday, when four military objects were blockaded and two generals were arrested and delivered in manacles to the state border.

These actions "cast doubt on promises of Latvia about its intention to solve all the problems of Russian troops in Latvia in a civilized way, the ability of the Latvian state to control activities of local troops under their command",

Ulmanis Views Order as 'Provocative'

LD1701185594 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1801 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Latvian President Guntis [illegible]is views as provocative, an order issued by the c[illegible]nd of the Northwestern Group of Russian Forces [illegible] week. The order allows the use of arms in case of attacks on, or other illegal actions toward Russian military personnel or military facilities. Ulmanis told a news conference this today, adding that such an action by the Russian side is not acceptable for him as president. Ulmanis believes that this step on the part of the command of the Northwestern Group of Forces is not a very correct reply to Ulmanis' correct action during the provocation of 10 January [when two Russian generals were detained by Latvians in Riga].

As Igor Golin, the head of the press center of the Northwestern Group of Forces told the Baltic News Agency, the above-mentioned order will not be applicable in cases when Latvian border guards detain Russian military personnel who try to enter Latvia without the necessary documents. According to Golin, the order allows a person who guards a Russian military facility located in Latvia to use arms in case of an attack after a verbal warning or warning shot in the air, as it is provided by the Russian military rules.

Russia Said Ready To 'Again Annex Baltics'

WS1701151794 Tallinn BNS in English 1517 GMT 15 Jan 94

[Excerpt] Riga, Jan 15, BNS—Russia is prepared to again annex the Baltic states at a moment's notice, Latvian Foreign Minister Georgs Andrejevs charged in an interview to BNS.

In Andrejevs' opinion, this is witnessed by Russia's reaction to the Jan. 10 incident in Riga when the arrest of two generals led to Russian troops stationed in Latvia being put on standby.

Andrejevs said the situation was critical, and that Russia gave a vivid demonstration of which methods it plans to use in an incident that could be solved through diplomatic channels.

The minister met yesterday with members of a CSCE mission to Latvia who were interested in how a country in a situation similar to the Jan. 10 incident can be helped. Andrejevs said that Russia's consent is needed so that international observers could attend the handover of Russian military facilities to Latvia. [passage omitted]

Skrunda Radar Station To Be Military Base

LD1401173494

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 1100 GMT on 14 January, during its regular newscast, broadcasts a report by an unidentified Mayak commentator on the Russian-Latvian talks on the Skrunda radar station.

Beginning his report, the commentator says another round in the Latvian-Russian talks has ended in Riga. The talks were held against the background of the recent provocation against two Russian generals. The commentator then switches to a report by Sergey Zotov, head of the Russian delegation at the talks.

Zotov begins by saying: "I think we have witnessed the starting point of a new policy by the president, of a new Russian policy. The whole package of measures that were adopted, first and foremost in the military and foreign policy sphere, shows clearly that from now on our concern for our compatriots, for human rights, no longer stop at declarations, though these are also important. Now, this concern and these slogans about defending human rights and our people are underpinned by a real mechanism for defending them. But in this case, we are talking about the protection of servicemen, direct symbols of the state. That is why I think it is very significant that throughout these events, we demonstrated our political will and made it clear what a repeat of such events would entail."

Zotov continues: "In the short term, these dramatic events have definitely had a negative effect on the talks, on bilateral relations. At the same time, they appear to have lanced the boil that has been swelling: It is no secret that, for a long time, Latvia has been pursuing the line that the withdrawal of Russian troops is to take place without any prior treaty. These events have yet again forced many in this country to realize that there will be no Lithuanian variant in this case, that for the Latvian people, for the Latvian politicians who want to keep their posts, it is important that the withdrawal of our troops takes place on the basis of a treaty and, accordingly, that all issues connected with this be agreed. From this point of view, it could be said that these events [the recent arrest of two Russian generals] have, to some extent, been a stimulus prompting Latvian politicians to adopt a more realistic stand.

"This was reflected in the discussion of an agreement between the two states on the legal status of the radar station Skrunda. We have always insisted that for Russia, this strategic installation is seen as having a military purpose. The Latvian side said it should be civilian. These events have again shown that ours was the correct line. This formula was established—Skrunda will now be a military installation.

"The second point is the coming together of the two sides on the issue of when this installation will function."

The commentator ends the report by saying that Zotov said agreements on all issues, including Skrunda, are to be finalized at a meeting of the sides in two weeks.

'Definite Compromise' Reached

PM1401162594 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jan 94 First Edition p 3

[Irina Litvinova report: "Russian Radar Station Will Probably Continue Operating in Latvia for Another Few Years"]

[Text] Riga—The latest round of interstate talks between the Latvian and Russian delegations has finished in Riga. Latvian observers are acknowledging that "some progress" has been made.

The main document concerning the withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvian territory has basically been prepared over more than two years of work by diplomats and military specialists. Until recently the stumbling block remained the Russian military installation in the Latvian settlement of Skrunda—a radar station which forms part of the overall missile early warning system.

Skrunda has been the central issue at three rounds of interstate talks. On this occasion, it seems, the two sides were able to reach a definite compromise. I am couching this affirmation in deliberately loose wording: It is clear that both sides could still make some adjustment to their positions. Thus, for example, coordinating the time frame for operating and dismantling the station will be a complex task, since Latvia is saying three years plus one, whereas Russia is insisting on a total of five years.

The talks took place against the background of an incident that made the work more difficult and which occurred 10 January in Riga, when two Russian generals were arrested. On 12 January the head of the Russian delegation, Special Envoy Sergey Zotov, told your IZVESTIYA correspondent that he thought it would be possible to resume the talks that had been broken off once the servicemen had been released, once the blockade of Russian installations had been lifted, and once the Latvian leadership had submitted an official apology. Envoy Zotov regards these events as a possible rehearsal for the seizure of Russian civilian installations, and for this reason the delegation stressed once again that the radar at Skrunda can only be used for military purposes. Deputy Foreign Minister Martins Virsis, head of the Latvian delegation, said that the Latvian view was as follows: The radar at Skrunda is a military establishment under civilian control. In any case, Virsis stressed, the station will not be given the status of a military base.

Ulmanis' 'Bewilderment' Over Clinton Remarks

LD1701210394 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1956 GMT 17 Jan 94

[Text] Latvian President Guntis Ulmanis has expressed on Monday a bewilderment in connection with the pronouncements on the problem of human rights in Latvia and Estonia made by the U.S. President Bill Clinton during his visit to Moscow.

"There are no violations of human rights of the sort which was alleged to", the Latvian president stressed at the briefing devoted to a regular meeting of the Council of National Security of the republic.

The results of the meeting of the U.S. and Russian presidents and the Partnership for Peace program in the NATO framework were discussed at the meeting.

"I cannot believe that the two superpowers have finally decided the fate of small countries" said G. Ulmanis answering the questions about the attitude to the references of B. Clinton and B. Yeltsin to the Baltic states, in particular to the dependence of the schedule of withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvia and Estonia on the solution of the human rights problem.

The president thinks that "a law on citizenship must be passed as soon as possible in Latvia which would exclude any speculations on the subject of human rights". Ulmanis said that he was expecting information from the Russian and American sides on the final deadline of withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvia and Estonia and on the conditions of keeping a Russian radar station on the territory of Latvia.

In the nearest future, said Ulmanis, Latvia will send a letter to the NATO leadership with agreement to participate in the Partnership for Progress [as received] in accordance with a decision taken at the Council of National Security meeting.

The president emphasized that in view of joining the Partnership for Progress, where Russia will also participate, Latvia must "carefully review its relations with Russia".

G. Ulmanis also said that the Latvia's joining of NATO is "a remote prospect".